Alexipharmacon:

OR, A

FRESH ANTIDOTE

AGAINST

Neonomian Bane and Poyſon

TO THE

Proteſtant Religion.

Being a Reply to the late Biſhop of *Worceſter*'s Diſcourſe of Chriſt's Satisfaction, in Anſwer to the Appeal of the late Mr. *Steph. Lob.*

And alſo a Refutation of the Doctrine of Juſtification by Man's own Works of Obedience, delivered and defended by Mr. *John Humphrey*, and Mr. *Sam. Clark*, contrary to Scripture, and the Doctrine of the firſt Reformers from Popery.

If there had been a Law given, which could have given Life; verily Righteouſneſs had been by the Law: But the Scripture hath concluded all under Sin, that the Promiſe by Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, might be given to them that believe, Gal. 3. 21, 22.

By *ISAAC CHAUNCY*, M. A.

London: Printed for, and Sold by *W. Marſhall* at the *Bible* in *Newgate-Street*, 1700.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

92d

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

THE Points Controverted in this small Treatise, are not of the least moment to the Christian Religion, all Reducible to these two great Questions.

1. Whether our Lord Jesus Christ in his Suffering, bore the Personal guilt of any or no?
2. Whether our Inherent Obedience to the New Law, be the Righteousness by which a Believer is Justified before God?

The first Question comes to be discussed upon the Controversie about change of Persons, *Mr.* Lob *asserting, That the change of Persons between Christ and Believers, consisted in Christ being made sin for us by the Imputation of our sins to him in a legal Sence, and a Believers being made the Righteousness of Christ by Imputation; and both by transaction of our Personal guilt and punishment (due to us) for Sin, to Christ; and of his righteousness in bearing sin and punishment, to us. This change of Persons the Scripture asserts in plain Words*

2 Cor. 5. 21. *This Mr.* Lob *asserts*, Report, p. 13. *and the Bishop denies, and saith, That the change was not in* respect of the guilt of Sin, because Christ bore the Personal guilt of none, and whatever Christ did or suffered, the personal guilt of sin remains on Believers and can never be taken away. *But he tells us of a kind of Change that he is for*, viz. *That* Christ was punisht, that we might not be punisht, *and this is all our* stead *that Christ stood in*; *now if Christ stood* not in our stead as Sinners, *and he was not made Sin for us, its to assert that which is Expresly contrary to Scripture, and most irrational to men of Understanding as shall be made appear. And the Change which is pretended by the Bishop is no change in the sence of the Spirit of God, at best it can be but a partial change, neither as a Publick person, nor in the Room of the Sinner as such: It is such a change as when three persons are condemned, and they are thro' the mercy of the Legislator to cast Lots for their lives, one only to die; now he on whom Deaths Lot falls, dieth that in the event the other may not die, yet this Person dieth but in Relation to his own Sins, not upon the account of the others Sins: Many Instances might be given of the like Nature, where a Man does or suffer for another, that the other may not; and here is a change of Persons in respect of Punity and Impunity, but* Note, *that its no true Change, if Desert remains on the Original Transgressor; and the Sufferer suffer under no Desert, neither is such Sufferings Punishment in any Law Sence, neither can that Person be ever Righteousness, that standeth in the Personal Guilt of his Sin unremoved; but this is not the Place to enlarge on this Point.*

I shall only Note, that in one thing the Bishop got the Weather-gage *of Mr.* Lob, *Mr.* Lob *having in express Terms renounced that Change of Persons, which Dr.* Crisp *Asserts. The Bishop very honestly proves, that*

Dr.

Dr. Crisp *asserted no other Change of Persons, then what Mr.* Lob *contends for, and therein he hath done Justice both to Dr.* Crisp, *and Mr.* Lob; *and truly its but a sorry Business of any Man of Learning and Ingenuity, to inveigh highly against the Opinion of another, as erroneous, when he himself is necessitated by his Principles to hold the same thing, only a little differing in way of Expressions. Neither let the Reader think, that I appear to Justifie Mr.* L.'s *appealing to the Bishop, for I was always against it, and declared to him, how much I and others was offended at it, and at his nauseous fawning and flattering of him, as if he intended to lay down his Faith at his Feet, for he could not but know the Bishops settled Opinion in this Point (as I told him) by the Letters he wrote to Mr.* H. *and Mr.* W. *yea, and to himself before his Appeal, and then if so, what a piece of Pageantry was it in him to Appeal to the Bishop? but it must be done, it seems the Wind of his Phantasie without any Reason hurrying him this Way, the Issue whereof is that, were Mr.* L. *alive, he would see he is inevitably run a ground; and therefore, although I can't get him off as to that matter yet, I hope to see the Truth safe, the main Thing which the Good Man contended for, for I am not to defend Men who will have their Imprudencies and Imperfections, but the good Cause he defended.*

The Second great Thing I contend for, is the Righteousness of Christ, *that it is the* only Righteousness that a Believer is justified by; *Mr.* Humphr. *and Mr.* Clerk *Assert our Justification by a Believers own inherent Righteousness,* i. e. *by their Works of* Obedience to the New Law, *a Tenent that hath an inseparable Connexion unto the former. I shall not detain the Reader any longer therein, but refer him to the Treatise it self.*

Lastly, *I finding in the Bishops Treatise, a Presentation of the* Independants, *brought in by the* Presbyterians, *for holding several* Antinomian Principles *which the Rebuker*

ker calls Bane and Poyſon, in that Form of Prayer which he hath taught his Diſciples. I have thought it requiſite to Entitle my Book accordingly Alexipharmacon, *and though I take the Rebuker to be of too haughty a Conſtitution* (*abounding in Choler*) *to be my Patient, yet I am not diſcouraged from expoſing this Preparation to Publick Advantage, not doubting but ſome may reap Benefit thereby; and hence I have endeavoured alſo to correct the Druggs, which the unskilful Rebuker hath caſt away with his* prophane Faugh, for Bane and Poyſon; *and ſhew, that if they be but a little ſcraped and wip'd from the Dirt and Filth, which he and his ſlovenly Apothecary hath put upon them, they will become a Chriſtians wholeſome Food, and ſubſtantial Medicine, being the* Fruit and Leaves of the Tree of Life for the healing of the Nations, *Rev.* 22. 2.

Books

A Catalogue of Mr, *Isaac Chauncy's* Books, Printed for, and Sold by *William Marshall*, at the *Bible* in *Newgate Street*.

1. *Neonomianism Unmask'd*: Or the Ancient Gospel pleaded for, against the other called, *a new Law or Gospel*, in a Theological Debate, occasioned by a Book lately wrote by Mr. *Dan. Williams*, entituled, *Gospel Truth stated & vindicated*, pri. 6 d.

2. The 2d part of *Neonomianism* un-mask'd, or the Ancient Gospel pleaded for, against the other called, *the New Law*, wherein the following Points are discoursed: 1. *What the state of the Elect is before effectual calling.* 2. *Whether Good laid our Sins on Christ.* 3. *Whether the Elect were discharg'd from sin upon Christ's bearing them.* 4. *Whether the elect cease to be sinners from the time their sins were laid on Christ.* 5. *What was the time when our sins were laid on Christ.* 6. *Whether God was separated from Christ while our sins were laid upon him.*

To be had with his whole Works, and not single; any other Part may be had single at the same Price set to them.

3. The 3d part of *Neonomianism Unmask'd*: Or the Ancient Gospel. Wherein these following *Points* are discussed: 1. *Of a Change of Person between Christ and the Elect.* 2. *Of the Conditionality of the Covenant of Grace.* 3. *Of the nature of Saving Faith.* 4. *Of the free offer of Christ to sinners, and of Preparatory Qualifications.* 5. *Of Union to Christ before Faith.* 6. *Of Justification by Faith.* 7. *Of the necessity and benefit of Holiness, Obedience and Good Works, with Perseverance therein.* 8. *Of intending our Souls Good, by Duties we perform.* 9. *Of the way to attain Assurance.* 10. *Of God's seeing Sin in his People.* 11. *Of the Hurt that sin may do to Believers.* 12. *Of Gods displeasure for sin in the afflictions of his People.* 13. *Of the Beauty of sincere Holiness.* 14. *Of Gospel and legal preaching.* 15. *Mr.* John Nisbet's *Reply to D W.*

Price 2 s. 6 d.

4. A Rejoinder; to Mr. *Dan. Williams's* Reply to the first part of *Neonomianism unmask't*; wherein his Defence is examined, and his Arguments answered, whereby he endeavours to prove the Gospel to be a new Law with Sanction, and the contrary is proved, 1. By shewing what a Law is. 2. By shewing what the Gospel is. 3. Several Arguments proving that the Gospel is not a New Law with Sanction. 4. An Account given of the Beginning and Progress of this *Neonomian* Error. Price 6 d.

5. A friendly Examination of the Pacifick Paper, concerning the consistency of absolute Election of particular Persons, with the Universality of Redemption, and the Conditionality of the Covenant of Grace; where also the new Scheme is clearly declared in several Questions and Answers about some great Points of

of Religion. 1. In understanding what Christ did in the flesh for all. 2. What he did in the Spirit only for his Elect. 3. As concerning the Law. 4. Of Justification. 5. Whether Salvation be possible to all Men by the Law of Grace, &c. Price 4 d.

Note. All these five Pieces are printed in Quarto, to bind together, and those that will have them compleat shall have them all bound together for 5 s.

6. ☞ Another very useful Book of *Isaac Chauncy*'s, M.A. Being a System, or Body of Divinity, Intituled, *The Doctrine which is according to Godliness*, grounded upon the holy Scriptures of Truth, and agreeable to the Doctrinal part of the *English Protestant* Articles and Confessors: to which is annexed, *The Congregational Church-Government.* 1. Of a visible Gospel Church. 2. Of Church Officers. 3. Of Church Ordinances. 4. Of Ordinances of Gospel Communion; And first of the *Seals.* 5. Concerning the *Keys.* 6. Of divers Duties which concern the comfort of Church Communion, *pr. bound* 2 s.

A Catalogue of some other Books lately Printed for *Will. Marshall*, and sold at the *Bible* in *Newgate Street.*

1. A *Discourse of Christian Religion in sundry Points. Preached at the Merchants Lecture, in* Broadstreet, *by the late Reverend Mr.* Tho. Cole, M. A. *and Student of* Christs College *in* Oxford. Price 2 s. 6 d.

2. *An Answer to six Arguments, produc'd by* Du-pin. *Likewise a Refutation of some of the false Conceits in Mr.* Lock's *Essay of Human Understanding. Price* 6 d.

3. *Stated Christian Conference, asserted to be a Christians Duty,* 6d.

4. *A new methodiz'd Concordance,* Price 6 d.

5. *A Compendium of the Covenant of Grace, as the most solid support under the most terrible Conflicts of Death, tho arm'd with Desertion, decay of Grace, and sense of Guilt, by* Walter Cross, M.A. 6 d.

6. Bunyan *of Election and Reprobation,* Price 6 d.

7. *Christianity the great Mystery, in answer to a late Treatise, intituled Christianity not Mysterious; together with a Postscript Letter to the Author.* Price 1 s.

8. *The young Man's Guide for Drawing, Limning and Etching, with printed Directions,* Price 1 s.

At the *Bible* in *Newgate Street*, you may be supplied with *all sorts of Printed Books* of most Authors, *Bibles, Testaments, Grammars*, with all sorts of *School-Books*, most sorts of *Almanacks*, OLD BOOKS New Bound of any sorts: Also all sorts of Stationary Wares, as *Paper, Pens, Ink, Wax, Bonds, Bills Funeral Tickets*, Printed at reasonable Rates. Also Dr. *Daffy*'s Cordial Elixir; *Blagrave*'s Spirit of Scurvigrass, both purging and plain. Queen of *Hungarys* Water. *Bromfield*'s PILLS.

SOME

REMARKS

UPON

The B. of W.s' diſcourſe concerning the doctrine of Satisfaction, in Anſwer to Mr. L.'s Appeal.

I ſhall not ſpend time in rectifying what the B. ſaith concerning the occaſion of the *preſent difference*, believing the B. ſaith nothing in this Matter but what he had from one Party concern'd, who gave him, as appears, a very *unfair and partial repreſentation* of theſe things, as they have done elſewhere; and therefore becauſe I will not *actum agere*, *I refer the Reader to the Hiſtory of the Union*, and *of the cauſes of the Breach thereof*, and counſel him as a Lover of Truth, to believe no more of what the B. writes on this account than what he finds is conſonant to the *ſaid Hiſtory*.

§. 2. I therefore paſs over to the ſecond Chapter of the *Myſtery of Antinom. laid open*; and *firſt*, I muſt take notice of the B. Conceſſion.

That if there were no more in the controverſie than what is contained in theſe terms, Relative [or Connexive] *Conditions, and Fœderal, the controverſie might fairly and eaſily been accommodated.*

I ſuppoſe this *accommodation* muſt have been by granting this disjunction to be true, and according to the rules of diſtribution, *That a condition is that which is Axiomatically expreſs d by the connexive conjunction Si*, If, and is the Logical knitting together of an *Antecedent and Conſequent*, but doth not neceſſarily import the connexion of cauſe and effect, but of a uſual or requiſite dependance; ſuch as is between *Antecedent and Conſequent*. e. gr. If I go to the *Exchange*, I muſt go out of my own houſe; if I *paſs into Glory*, *I muſt paſs thro' the State of Grace*; not that the ſtate of Grace is *any meritorious cauſe of Glory*, but that there is ſuch a cauſe of both, and to which both anſwer as effects equally, altho' one precede the other in order. But *fœderal conditions* are quite of another nature, of a covenant and moral nature; a covenant, having but two parts, the *condition* and *promiſe made upon the performance of the condition*, by the party required ſo to do, whereby the good thing promiſed, upon the ſaid performance of the condition is *demandable* by the performer, as *due debt* to him. Hence it's the *fœderal nature* of the condition, not the greatneſs or ſmallneſs of the condition that makes it *meritorious*. If God had ſaid unto man in Paradice, *Take up this leaf or that ſtraw*, and thou ſhalt live for ever, eternal life had been his due, upon his doing thereof, and demandable by him, and the covenant made it ſo; *viz.* a *due debt*, *ex pacto*, i. e. legally ſo; for a due debt is due in a law ſenſe.

§. 2. Now

§ 2. Now what hinders this *deſirable accommodation*? It is the B's opinion that there is a greater miſchief in Antinomianiſm, [*a Snake in the Graſs*] which ought to be laid open, to prevent the miſchief of it. Antinomianiſm the B. knows in true notation of the word, and according to the ſenſe of the Apoſtle *Paul*, is a denial of the Juſtification of a ſinner by our own works of the law, the miſchief that attends it is only occaſional, by reaſon of men's corruption, *viz.* The vileneſs of corrupt and reprobate minds in the abuſe of the grace of God therein, to embolden themſelves, *to ſin, becauſe grace abounds*; which the Apoſtle was aware of, and warns us againſt, *Rom. 6.* It is not any fault in the doctrine it ſelf. Well, but *what* is the miſchief the B. finds? 'It is (ſaith he) *this, all this diſpute* 'about conditions on our part depends upon another; 'and if that hold, this muſt follow as a conſequence 'of it, and ſeveral other things which Dr. Criſp 'ſaw very well, had a neceſſary connexion with each 'other, like a fair dealer in controverſie, owned 'them all. Here I cannot but acknowledge the *great ingenuity* of the B. beyond many others, in not only owning him a *fair dealer* in this controverſie that he oppoſeth him in, but in his after vindication of him from thoſe *falſe imputations*, which others of his adverſaries would faſten upon him ſo far, that he leaves him a mere *Calviniſt*, and no worſe.

§. 3. *p.* 74. B. I come therefore to the next thing in the firſt Paper, 'wherein you ſay [i. e. *Mr.* L.] *clears* 'the diſſenting brethren from the charge of Anti-'nomianiſm, Report, p. 13. Rem. p. 11. *Your words* 'are, [i. e. *Mr.* L.'s] *That touching a Change of* 'Perſons between Chriſt and believers, there is no 'phyſical change, whereby Chriſt and believers do in

'*ſtance become one another, nor a moral change,* '*whereby Chriſt ſhould become inherently ſinful,* '*and Believers thereby become immediately innocent,* '*and ſinleſs, but the change is only in a legal ſenſe* '*by conſent between the Father and him, putting on* '*the perſon, and coming into the room and ſtead of* '*ſinners*, &c,

This is laid down for the truth of this change by Mr. *L.* but yet Mr. *L.* peremptorily diſowns Dr. *Criſp*'s change of Perſons, as well as Mr. *W.* Now the B. doth very fairly ſhew and prove, that Dr. *Criſp* intended no other change of Perſons than what Mr. *L.* aſſerts to be the truth, and a clearing the aſſertors from the charge of Antinom. *Now ſaith he, I ſhall make it appear that you have not herein diſowned Dr.* Criſp's *ſence of the change of perſons*; ſo far I cannot but ſay, that the B. hath done right to Dr. *Criſp* and Mr. *L.* and it's no other than what I ever thought of the controverſie, when on foot. I ſhall not give my ſelf the trouble of tranſcribing what the B. hath done out of Dr. *Criſp*'s Sermons, to prove his aſſertion. See *p.* 2. *p.* 75, 76, 77.

§. 4. '*This ſeems to be a great Myſtery, but is re-* '*ally the foundation of Antinomianiſm. That Chriſt* '*had the perſonal guilt of our tranſgreſſions charged* '*upon him, and ſo he was as ſinful as we.* He ſhould have added *legally*, or in the *eye of the law*, the guilt of our ſins, *the perſonal guilt* of every ſaved one being charged upon him, the *Reatus Culpæ non perpetratio culpæ*; the debt, *non contractio debiti.* This is the truth of the Goſpel, which will ſtand as a pillar of braſs, when all the wit and malice of the oppoſers and banterers thereof will be driven away as chaff before the wind. Here are two aſſertions that

we

we muſt ſtand by and defend the truth of againſt the B. and all other oppoſers.

In the B.'s firſt Letter he tells us what the Report ſaith, *p.* 5. ‘ *That if there be no change of perſons between Chriſt and us, there can be no tranſlation of the guilt, nor a juſt infliction of the puniſhment of our ſins on Chriſt*; i. e. *there can be no proper ſatisfaction*, which is truth without exception. But the B. anſwers, ‘ *That there is a twofold tranſlation of guilt to be conſidered.* 1. ‘ *Of the perſonal guilt which reſults from the acts of ſin committed by ſuch perſons.* Now the tranſlation of this guilt of ſin on Chriſt the B. all along denies, and endeavours to diſprove, 1. Perſonal guilt can be no other than the guilt of the Perſon that had committed the ſin, for which he is arraign'd at the Bar of God's Law, *e. gr. John* hath ſtolen, *Thomas* hath committed murder, and neither the guilt of *John*'s theft, nor of *Thomas*'s murder was transferred to Jeſus Chriſt; *David*'s murder and adultery in the guilt thereof was not transferred to Jeſus Chriſt, nor the guilt of *Peter*'s ſin in denying his Maſter. This is the meaning of the B. doctrine.

2. He gives his reaſon; ‘ *If this guilt be tranſlated, Chriſt muſt become the very perſon who committed the ſins, and ſo become an actual Sinner*; ‘ *yea, as the Perſon that committed all the ſins of thoſe for whom he died.*

I wonder ſo learned a man ſaw not the abſurdity of this arguing, which he took up from Mr. *B.* who never ſtuck at any groſs arguments to beſpatter the moſt glorious Goſpel truths. The force of the argument is thus unfolded, and made very plain. If a debt be tranſlated from one man to another, then he to whom it is tranſlated muſt be looked upon

on as the person that contracted the debt; but the B. saith, We must not look upon sins as debts, which we shall speak to in its place; but let us use another instance, If a thing done by one man be accounted to another, *e. gr.* a Representative in Parliament, is that thing to be thought to be actually and personally performed by the persons to whom it's accounted. The Representatives of the people in *Denmark* gave up the liberties of the people to the King's prerogative, the people by them are accounted to have done it by the Representatives, must therefore every Subject be said actually and personally to have done it, when doubtless Hundreds of lovers of the country hated and detested the Action, tho' as necessarily included therein, as if they had actually done it. Many Instances of the like nature might be given, tho' these are enough to demonstrate the falseness of the B's odious consequence; and we may as well wonder that any that bear any reverence to our blessed Saviour, should not abhor such dirty and irrational consequences as these are, especially when so expressly contrary to the word of God and common reason. *Isa.*53. 2 *Cor.*5. 3. Hence these men dare not but say there is a guilt translated to Christ: I pray what guilt? Is it not personal? Is there any guilt in the world besides what is of one Person or another? But our B. will find out a guilt that's not personal, which we will examine.

§. 5. The other branch of his division of translation of guilt, '*is of Legal Guilt*, which he saith '*lyes in an obligation to Punishment by virtue of* '*the Sanction of the Divine Law. Now this guilt* '*implies two things*; 1. *The desert of Punishment* '*which follows personal guilt, and cannot be trans-* '*ferred by change of persons*, &c. 2. *The obliga-*

'*tion*

'*tion to undergo the deſerved puniſhment, here* '*may intervene a change of perſons*, &c.

Reader, Now obſerve what kind of guilt the B. will have Chriſt to bear: 1. He ſaith it's legal guilt, but what's that according to him? It's the *obligation to puniſhment, and that's in the ſanction of the law*; i. e. it's ſubjectively in the law, hence it's the *guilt of the law* that Chriſt muſt bear, and not the guilt of any perſon. It's true, that obligation to puniſhment is formally in the law, and therefore obligation to puniſhment cannot be called guilt, but *guilt is of a perſon tranſgreſſing* the law, not in the law tranſgreſſed. 2. He ſaith this guilt implies two things: What is the meaning of implies? Is it that the laws obligation of a tranſgreſſor to puniſhment eſſentially contains in it thoſe two things? 1. An actual deſert of puniſhment, and obligation of ſome Perſon to undergo it. Surely not, for if the law had never been tranſgreſſed, it had contain'd this in it; that if ever any do deſerve it, they ſhall be obliged to puniſhment. 2. Doth it imply theſe integrally their deſert of puniſhment, and obligation to puniſhment are the parts of the forenamed legal guilt, then the deſert of puniſhment, as well as obligation to puniſhment; *i. e.* no other than the fault muſt lye in the law, for it can't be in more ſubjects than one, and the B. muſt come under the force of this *Dilemma*, if he will allow any ſuch thing as guilt, that it is *ſubjectively* in ſome perſon, and ſo *perſonal*, or *in the law it ſelf*. Now there's no *fault* in the law, therefore no *guilt*. 3. He ſaith, deſert of puniſhment *follows perſonal guilt*, but by his favour it is perſonal guilt it ſelf, the *merit of puniſhment* is in the fault, the very ἀνομία· for what deſerves puniſhment but ſin, to which the law

makes

makes the wages of Death due; *not continuing in all things written in the law?* The law enquires no further than it finds the fault, wherein it hath found the desert; it's formally and essentially in it; it's true, the sentence follows this, but the desert lyes in the essential moral contrariety of the action to the obedience of the law required it; the wisdom of God saith, the taking away of guilt is to take away sin.

4. He asserts, but hath not proved, 'That personal guilt can't be transferred by change of persons: His strong reason is, *For no man can cease to deserve punishment for his own faults, nor deserve that another should be punished for them.* The assertion is, that *personal guilt* can't be transferred; then certainly no guilt at all; for there is no guilt but is personally contracted, and personally adhering, and therefore Christ bore no guilt of Sin at all, most contrary to Scripture, and the very known nature of a surety, which always is in bearing the sin of the transgressor by change of persons. 2. He argues to prove it, *That no man can cease to deserve punishment for his own faults.* An excellent assertion: If so, I am sure God can't cease to punish him, for he renders to every one according to his deserts, he is a just God. 2. This position throws down the whole satisfaction of Christ at one blow; for if Christ hath not taken off the personal desert of sin from any, he hath not satisfied the law; for if according to the B. he takes off the legal obligation of any to punishment, he takes off the desert by the law. 3. It will follow, that not only believers, but the glorified Saints in Heaven, are still under the personal guilt and desert of punishment; and if so, they

they can't be in the favour of God, they can't be ἄμωμοι, without ſpot before the Throne, they are under the perſonal guilt of all their ſins, and this is no ſpot of God's Children, but an eſſential form of a Helliſh State. The B. here hath very inconſiderately run himſelf upon the rocks, tho' with the reſt of the Neonomians he doth ſo frequently charge thoſe that are contrary minded with Shallowneſs, Illiterateneſs, *&c.* It is one thing to *ſin and contract* a *perſonal guilt*, and another thing to lye *under this perſonal guilt*; ſure bare pardon of ſin by him that hath power to pardon, takes off *perſonal guilt* in the B's ſence, the obligation of the perſon to puniſhment, elſe after pardon the law may take him up again, and would, even in mens proceedings by law; but in God's there's not only the pardon of the ſinner, but a juſt ſatisfaction to the law, *Rom.* 8. 1.

§. 6. The B. adds,——*Nor deſerve that another ſhould be puniſh'd for them.* What will not men of perverſe minds ſay?

Whoever aſſerted that ſinners deſerved that Chriſt ſhould ſuffer for them, I wonder men are not aſham'd of ſuch groſs impoſitions, quite contrary to the known minds of others, but to the nature of the thing; for where did any debtor or criminal deſerve that another ſhould ſuffer for him, either by his good works, to deſerve ſo much good of another, or by his evil works, to make another, that is neither criminal nor acceſſory, guilty? How much leſs may it be ſaid of us that we deſerved that Chriſt ſhould be puniſhed for us? The B. ſaith Chriſt *was puniſhed for us*, the obligation of the law binding us over to puniſhment, and that Chriſt took the puniſhment in our ſtead; was it becauſe we deſerv'd it, or not? If it was not becauſe we deſerv'd it, it

was not in our ſtead; we ſay not that it was in the nature of our ſins to deſerve his puniſhment, but in the grace, wiſdom and juſtice of the Legiſlator. As the B. ſaith, it was of grace of God to find a ranſom, it was of the grace of the Son to give up himſelf unto juſtice for this end, it was to the honour of divine juſtice to accept of his glorious ſatisfaction in the ſinners room and ſtead; here's nothing of the ſinner's deſerving that brought Chriſt's ſuffering for the ſinners, but the ſubſtitution of Chriſt, for this end, by the Father and himſelf, tho' the ſinner deſerves puniſhment.

§. 7. The ſecond thing according to the B. implied in ' *Legal guilt, is obligation to undergo the de-* ' *ſerved puniſhment, but becauſe the execution of* ' *puniſhment depends on the wiſdom and juſtice of* ' *the Legiſlator, therefore here a change of perſon* ' *may intervene.* *A.* It behoves us to be exact with the B. here, becauſe he acquaints us with a curioſity in this point of change of perſons, that of late men have ſo ſhittlecock'd it up and down, that it's hard to find what either ſide would have, but what they both agreed in, that they would not have it to be what Dr. *Criſp* ſaid it was. 1. What is the reaſon the B. diſtinguiſheth the *obligation to undergo the deſerved puniſhment, and execution of puniſhment?* Why ſaith he, *not execution of deſerved puniſhment?* To me it ſeems to be a very ſmatch of *Socinianiſm*; as if Chriſt did not undergo any *deſerved puniſhment*, but only a *puniſhment without deſert*; i. e. only *ſuffering*, and not *puniſhment* in any proper ſence. 2. If obligation to undergo the deſerved puniſhment be the guilt only tranſferred to Chriſt, then it will follow, it's only the guilt of the law is charged on Chriſt, not of the finner;

ſinner; and it's plain the B. means ſo, for he denies that the guilt of any perſon is charged on Chriſt. 3. He ſaith, this *obligation to puniſhment* is only in the law *and its truth*, therefore he means that this law obligation falling on Chriſt, is all the guilt that falls upon him, and here may be no change of perſons; for tho' the law obligation may fall upon *John* and *Thomas*, and *John* be never the better that it falls on *Thomas*, becauſe it falls not on *Thomas* for the ſake of *John*: But he ſaith, that here a change of perſons may intervene; how? between two perſons to undergo puniſhments? If ſo, it muſt be under one and the ſame law, not a change from being under one law, to a being under another. 2. It muſt be a change in reſpect of deſerved puniſhment; for puniſhment cannot be without deſert, it becomes not the wiſdom and juſtice of God that it ſhould be be ſo. 3 If the change be in reſpect of deſerved puniſhment, we have gained as much as we expect; for then the deſert of the ſinner, which is of his fault, and his guilt is tranſlated to Chriſt, becauſe his puniſhment was deſerved, *e. gr.* he bore the deſerved puniſhment of ſin, of what or whom, of the law; nay, the law never deſerved puniſhment of any perſons; nay, quoth the B. he bore no perſonal guilt, then there is no change in reſpect of deſerved puniſhment; Chriſt ſuffer'd for us, but was not puniſhed for any, he ſuffered no deſerved puniſhment? Hence no puniſhment at all, for all juſt puniſhment is due.

§. 8. He ſaith, '*The execution of puniſhment* '*depends on the wiſdom and juſtice of the Legiſla-* '*tor.* It is true, therefore ought not the execution of puniſhment anſwer the obligation to it? Is it wiſdom and juſtice in God to oblige in his law, to

any punishment not deserved? And is it wisdom or justice in God to oblige in his law to deserved punishment, and not to execute deserved punishments? For if Christ's punishments were not deserved, they were meer sufferings; and if so, no more to us than the suffering of a Martyr to us; if deserved suffering, then, 1. According to some rule of justice. 2. Deserved by himself, or some others; not by himself, and his own individual person, you will say; therefore by some other. Hence if Christ bore deserved punishments of others, he bore the guilt of sin, the *Reatus culpæ*, that being the formal desert of punishment, the law making it so, either of God or Man. He saith, 'By *the wisdom and justice of* 'God a mediator may be accepted in such a man-'ner as himself hath determined, and upon accep-'tance of his Sacrifice the offenders may be par-'doned, and received into grace and favour of God 'on such terms as he hath declared in the Gospel, 'and in this sence is the guilt of sins charged on 'Christ, &c. *A.* It is much that these men can take upon themselves a power of directing God, and telling him what he may do, when God hath never said that he did or would do so, the true Explanation of the B's sence in this paragraph is by the new-coin'd law, but we will take him in his own terms: And I say, in God's execution of punishment it becomes the wisdom and justice of God to do it according to a promulgated law, which the Legislator hath in his wisdom and justice made a manifest *Norma Justitiæ*, to shew forth his justice, and that God may be justified as Judge of all the world, to deal righteously, and therefore not to accept of a Sinner or a Mediator for them upon other terms than is in his law expres'd, and not upon

other

other ſecret and unknown terms. 2. How may God accept of a Mediator? Is it not in ſatisfying for the ſinner, in bearing the ſinners deſerved puniſhment, and therein taking off the laws obligation of the Sinner to puniſhment? God can't otherwiſe do in wiſdom or juſtice. 3. He makes God's acceptance of a ſacrifice to be an antecedent of pardon only, not a ſatisfying and meritorious reaſon thereof. 4. How doth God accept Chriſt's ſacrifice, as a ſingle noble act, done by him, wherein none is concern'd but himſelf; or a qualifying act to God himſelf, to make him able to pardon? Or doth he accept his ſacrifice for ſinners deſerving puniſhment under the law? Taking their deſerts and puniſhment upon himſelf, then he is a mediatorial ſacrifice; otherwiſe, if the guilt lyes upon perſons unremoved, he is neither a ſacrifice for their ſins, nor accepted of God as ſuch. 5. Is it according to the juſtice of God to accept a ſacrifice for ſinners, whoſe perſonal guilt he never took away thereby, and pardon and receive them into favour upon other terms afterwards? Sure then the mediator is not accepted till they have performed thoſe conditions, upon which their pardon and acceptance is laid.

§. 9. 'In anſwer to the Reporter, p. 8. he takes 'occaſion to tell him that the Conſideration of ſins 'as debts is a wrong notion, and gives up the point 'of Satisfaction to the Socinians. If it do, it doth but as the B. and his right Reverend Father Mr. *B.* hath done, from whom he took up this divinity. It ſeems the ſpirit of God did not ſo well conſider of it as the B. hath done, nor our maſter the Lord Jeſus, when he taught his diſciples to pray ſo; I know it ſticks cruelly in the Neonom. ſtomachs that our Lord Jeſus was ſo raſh and inconſiderate to make uſe

of

of this word debt for sin; but why doth this give away the cause to *Socinians*? '*Because if sins be* '*considered as debts, God may freely forgive them* '*(without disparagement to his wisdom and justice)* '*without any Satisfaction.* But what if God will not? He hath revealed this in his word, that he will by no means acquit the guilty without satisfaction; we are not speaking of God's absolute Power, but of his ordinate; neither are we speaking of God's acting by his soveraign dominion, but by his acting in a way of justice; because where there's sin, there is a law transgressed, and God's dealing with the sinner must be in a way of justice, unless God repeal his law, or dispense with it, as the Neonom. will have it, but we can't admit thereof. But, 2. Why can't God upon the same reason forgive a criminal by his prerogative, as well as a debtor? An earthly King may, why not the King of Kings? 3. And why is not sin a debt in a proper sence enough? Is it not a debt to God's justice, and made so by God's law, and treated as such in the very point of Satisfaction? It's such a Debt as must be satisfied, 1 *Pet.* 1. 18, 19. 1 *Cor.* 6. 23, and 7. 23. and elsewhere, must it of necessity be a money-debt, and no other? He saith, '*I can't but wonder at the learn-* '*ed author, that he doth at the same time assert our* '*sins to be considered as debts, and the necessity of* '*vindictive justice; for what vindictive justice* '*belongs to a creditor?* I have rather wondred at the learned Author, that he should be taken with such a *Delirium*, as to suppose B. *Stillingfleet* to be for a Commutation of Persons in *sano sensu*, having been sufficiently informed by his Letters of his Neonom. principles, before he appeal to him, and flattered him so offensively as he did. But *ad rem*,

1. The

1. The B. knew that ſimilitude or metaphorical expreſſions *are not to be forc'd to run on four feet*; for tho' ſins be moſt fitly called debts to the juſtice of God, yet God is not therefore a money creditor, but with *neceſſity of Vindictive Juſtice to a creditor*; ſure, impriſonment is vindictive juſtice, or ſeizing on all that a man hath; doth not God in juſtice ſeize on all a ſinner hath by his curſe, and caſt him into priſon till he hath paid the utmoſt Farthing? *Matth.* 5. 26. Sure Chriſt's own Phraſeology might be admitted by us, but it ſeems not by this B. and ſome others; ſee further his Neonom. ſpirit; he calls Chriſt's language, in calling ſin debts to God, and aſcribing '*Vindictive Juſtice* '*to ſuch an adverſary rude and inconſiſtent, and* '*he can hardly think ſuch ever penetrated into theſe* '*matters, but took up with a ſett of phraſes.* I always found theſe Neonom. great boaſters of their own wit, and deep penetration into things; anſwer their adverſaries ſtill more by contemptuous and approbrious language, than by any fair way of argumentation; tho' I muſt confeſs I do not find this learned B. ſo addicted to this foul way of treating thoſe that diſſent from him, as many others of the Neonom. kidney that are far ſhort of him in learning and gentility.

The main deſign of this diſcourſe, in anſwer to Mr. *Lob*'s Appeal, is to ſhew how much the good man was miſtaken, as to believe that he, the B. was for Commutation of perſons in his ſence, but he was for Commutation in Mr. *W.* and the Neonom. ſence. The meaning of all, that there hath been ſuch a ſputter about, and ſo much foul language, unbecoming Chriſtians, much more Miniſters, lyes in this one Queſtion, whether Chriſt was *made of God*

God ſin and curſe for ſinners? And whether the ſaid ſinners believing *become the righteouſneſs of God* in him? The Commutation according to ſcripture lyes here; that *Chriſt inſtead of the guilty ſinner became ſin and curſe, and that the Sinner in Chriſt becomes righteous and guitleſs.* Now ſaith the B. That the change was not in reſpect of ſin, aſſerting that Chriſt bore no perſonal guilt, but that he bore only puniſhment, that we ſhould not be puniſh'd upon our Faith and Repentance; ſo that he muſt hold the Commutation of perſons is not in reſpect of ſin and righteouſneſs, (for that perſon that is taken from the guilt of ſin *in foro juſtitiæ*, can never be righteous) but only in reſpect of puniſhment and impunity. 4. That Chriſt was puniſh'd, that the ſinner might not, but that this change was not abſolute, but conditional; and to be future upon terms to be performed by one party, when he ſhould have an actual Being in the world, when he ſhould perform the fixed conditions of Faith, Repentance, and good Works. Again, he will not have it ſuch a change as is between the ſurety and debtor, but ſuch a change as is between two private perſons; one doing a good turn for, on the behalf, and ſo inſtead of the other denying Chriſt to be a publick perſon, to be in his Mediatorſhip a ſurety, or legal Repreſentative before God's Tribunal of Juſtice; and this I find every where to be the Neonom. Doctrine: But I ſhall aſſert, that the B's change of perſons is none at all; for if it be not of perſons as ſtanding in relation to the law, it's none at all in a law ſence; Chriſt bearing no guilt by law obligation, and the ſinner being freed from none thereby, this is enough to ſay of it here, my deſign being to be ſhort, I can't fill up my paper with rehearſal

hearſal of the very Words which I have tired my ſelf too much in already, nor enter upon a tedious Litigation about Words or Senſe of them; and if Dr *Criſp* or the Bp. have not well expreſs'd themſelves, I leave thoſe Words to themſelves, and apply my ſelf only to the true ſenſe and meaning of the Bp. in that point, which he mainly proſecutes in this treatiſe.

Bp. *p.* 79. ' *My buſineſs at preſent is about tranſ-* ' *ferring our very faults upon Chriſt, which Dr.* Criſp *calls the guilt of the fact.* *A.* I need not here tell the Reader that the Aſſertor doth diſtinguiſh between the fact and the guilt of the fact, the *Culpa & reatus culpæ*; the Bp. himſelf hath vindicated him from the charge, of ſaying that the fact it ſelf was charged on Chriſt, *p.* 77. ' *Dr.* Criſp ' *denies Chriſt to be the actual tranſgreſſor, but aſ-* ' *ſerted that he had the perſonal guilt of our Sins* ' *upon him, and built his whole Hypotheſis upon it.* This then is the Queſtion in ſhort to be diſcuſſed, *Whether Chriſt in his ſufferings bare upon him the perſonal guilt of Sin?* The affirmative is the truth in our judgment, let who will aſſert it; the Bp. holds the negative throughout his treatiſe, as being the vertical point, upon which the whole controverſie of *change of perſons* doth turn.

§. 2. I deſire to ſpeak as plainly in this matter as may be, and as briefly, and ſhall paſs over all the proofs that the Bp. hath made, that this was the Dr's judgment, with this conceſſion that it was ſo, yea, and all the needleſs remarks, interpretations and banters that he hath upon what the Doctor hath ſaid, and only take notice of the things of weight. But firſt it is neceſſary to ſhew how we underſtand this Queſtion.

1. In what capacity Christ ſtood when he bore ſin and puniſhment?
2. In what ſenſe he bore ſin?
3. What perſonal guilt is?
4. How Christ came to bear perſonal guilt?

A. As to the firſt, that Christ ſtood in the capacity of a publick perſon, repreſenting the whole body of the Elect under the conſideration of the lapſed Eſtate and Condition in the firſt *Adam.*

As to the ſecond, when we ſay *Chriſt bore Sin*, it's neither treaſon or blaſphemy, as our Adverſaries would have it, becauſe we ſpeak in the language of the Spirit of God; however, to prevent cavilling, we will vouchſafe to yeild to the Bp's term, *perſonal guilt*, which can import nothing but the committed Sin remaining on the ſinner's perſon and conſcience, as a forbidden and condemned fault by the law; neither do we ſay that Chriſt committed theſe Sins, or was made to have committed them when our Sins were laid upon him, neither that his Nature was phyſically or morally corrupted thereby. *Laſtly*, We cannot but adore the wiſdom of God, in calling perſonal guilt Sin, becauſe, 1. A bare phyſical Act as ſuch is not Sin, and as all killing is not ſin, but Sin is a phyſical Act cloathed with a moral Exorbitancy ariſing from its relation to, and comparing with the law of God, therefore, to ſay the *ſubſtratum* of the phyſical act or defect, is transferred from one ſubject to another, is moſt abſurd; but the guilt of this fact, and its moral relation to the law, may be transferred and taken away from the ſubject tranſgreſſor, as we ſhall make it appear.

As to the third, the Bp. tells us what he means by perſonal guilt, and it's very plain. *David*'s perſonal guilt was of Murder and Adultery, ſo *Peter*'s of

of denying his Maſter. Now the Bp. will not have *perſonal guilt* ever to be taken off from any, but that *David* continues in Heaven under perſonal guilt of Murder and Adultery to this Day, and for ever.

Laſtly, Chriſt came to bear Sin; 1. By God's call, and his acceptance, voluntarily obeying his Father's command. 2. In ſubmitting himſelf to a legal way of proceeding with him when he came under the ſame law the tranſgreſſor was under. 3. By a legal accounting and imputing our Sin to him, he coming *in forum Juſtitiæ*, and writing himſelf debtor in the room and ſtead of all the inſolvent debtors to the Law of God, Juſtice accepts of him as a ſufficient Paymaſter. Hence in the *law ſenſe* Chriſt was called by God, what he was not in a *natural ſenſe*, *Rom.* 4. He was made Sin, who knew no Sin; and God calls things that are not, as tho' they were, both in calling Chriſt Sin, and us Righteous.

§. 3. Now we ſay that *Commutation of Perſons*, was ſo far, and no more nor leſs than God hath made it to be in his legal way of proceeding in this great myſtery: That Chriſt ſhould according to the Preordination and Conſtitution of the Father, freely put himſelf under a *judicial Proceſs* for the Sins of all the Elect under the ſame law that they tranſgreſſed, and that Juſtice ſhould deal with him as if he had been the original tranſgreſſor; and in the ſtead thereof, in transferring the charge upon him, and puniſhing him for Sin. Hereupon follows the change, that *he is made Sin, and we Righteouſneſs in him*, Juſtice receiving full ſatisfaction for our Sins. Hence we ſhall not much trouble ourſelves with the many odious Inferences that the

Neonom. would draw upon this glorious Myſtery, nor the dirty Reflections on the unſearchable Wiſdom of God, the Truth being as fully and plainly made manifeſt in Holy Writ, as any doctrine of Godlineſs.

1. It is plain that Sin was laid on Chriſt in ſome ſence or other, the Scripture being ſo expreſs in it. 2. It's granted on all hands the phyſical part of the Act was not transferred to Chriſt; after which, that which remains on the Sinner is the guilt of it, which is his relation to the law in the moral ſenſe, as a tranſgreſſor, and muſt be his ἀνομία, the laws condemnation of the Fact making his guilt or deſert of puniſhment. 3. The Spirit of God calls this Merit or Deſert, Sin, and ſhall we call it contrary to Scripture? Where doth the Scripture ſay it was not? It ſaith again and again that it was, and what if contrary to the Bp's reaſon? Are we to believe God or Man? Is the Bp's reaſon the rule of our Faith? What if the ſame word be uſed in Scripture for Sin and Puniſhment? I grant that one word in Hebrew is uſed for Sin, and the Sacrifice for Sin ſometimes; but when it's uſed for the Sacrifice, it's therefore uſed, becauſe Sin was judicially transferred to the Sacrifice; that it bore the Sin of the Tranſgreſſor, ſo that it became the *formalis ratio* of its Suffering; and therefore it's denominated from its moſt eſſential cauſe. To ſay it's a tropical word, is not much to the purpoſe, it being ſuch as expreſſeth the very nature of the thing as often in Scripture by a Metonimy, *Senſus pornitur pro ſenſili*, a Grace of the Spirit put for the Object, Faith for the Object, and Hope for its Object; ſo here Sin for the perſonal guilt of Sin, the Subject put for an eſſential or proper Production:

It's

It's a Metan. of another nature from that, this is my Body, where *Signum* is put for *Signatum*, and its true the Scripture doth always denote the guilt of Sin *by Sin*, and the Bp. doth concede, *that Puniſhment is not Sin*, but a Conſequent of guilt; we ſay it's more than a mere Conſequent, it is a merited effect, and Sin always deſerves and merits Puniſhment, tho' no Sinner merited, that a Surety ſhould be puniſhed for him; this is by Gracious *Surrogation* or Subſtitution. And it's to contradict Scripture, to make Puniſhment ſeparable from guilt, and for good reaſon to; for no juſt Law puniſheth any one but the guilty, whereby it's always ſaid that Sin lyes upon him, *i. e.* the juſt charge of Sin.

§. 4. Bp. Obj. *But Puniſhment muſt have relation to Sin as to the ſame Perſon.* This is true, it muſt, and always hath; Sin is inſeparable from Puniſhment in the ſame Perſon according to the juſt Terms and Conſtitution of any Law, by which any Perſon is puniſhed.

'*To this the Bp. ſaith, he anſwers diſtinctly, that* '*there are three ways our Sins are ſaid to have re-* '*lation to Chriſt's Sufferings.* 1. *As an external im-* '*pulſive cauſe no more than occaſional, no proper rea-* '*ſon of Puniſhment; and ſo for the Socinians.* This I ſuppoſe he leaves to the Socinians, with whom Mr. *B.* is one in this point. 2. '*As an impulſive* '*cauſe becomes meritorious by the voluntary Act of* '*Chriſt's undertaking to ſatisfie Divine Juſtice for* '*our Sins, and not as his own.* 3. *As to the Per-* '*ſonal guilt of our Sins.*

Theſe three ways of Sin's relation to Chriſt, we will conſider. 1. The fact of Sin, and from it the guilt of it is the proper meritorious cauſe of Puniſhment;

niſhment; it's *cauſa proegumena*, internal always to the puniſhed, let the Socin. and Mr. *B.* ſay what they will, the puniſhed is always the guilty Perſon, and he is therefore puniſhed, becauſe guilty. 2. This Impulſive *of ours becomes meritorious*; he ſaith, how I pray? By *Chriſt voluntary undertaking*, &c. This is very abſurd, that Chriſt's free undertaking ſhould make Sin meritorious, was not Sin meritorious of Puniſhment of it ſelf. What is the Sin of faln Angels, that Chriſt never undertook for? But he ſhould have ſaid that Chriſt's voluntary undertaking brought the guilt and puniſhment upon himſelf, by his coming under a Law Tranſaction; for he ſaith, it was to ſatisfie Divine Juſtice; and can Juſtice be ſatisfied by the Sufferings of a Perſon no way guilty in the Eye of Juſtice? That's ſtrange Juſtice. But ſtill ſaith the Bp. *They are conſider'd as our Sins, and not his*; true, our Sins originally, but his by a *Law Tranſmiſſion*, elſe he could not be puniſhed by the Law.

But now ſee how the Bp. after his brandiſhing by way of Oppoſition, is neceſſitated to fall into rank and file with us. 'They are not Chriſt's Sins any fur-'ther than by conſent he took upon himſelf to bear 'the guilt which relates to Puniſhment, and ſo they 'come to be juſtly charged upon him. Now I pray what is it that the Bp. ſaith in the winding up of the Matter more than what we ſay; for he ſaith, 1. The Sins were ours, not his originally and primarily, and the guilt remains in all thoſe for which Chriſt died not. 2. Theſe Sins of all ſaved ones become Chriſt's in the guilt of them, thro' his free and voluntary Intervention. 3. That he took upon himſelf that guilt which relates to puniſhment; *i. e.* its proper law relation. 4. And ſo they come

to

to be juſtly charged upon him; here the Bp hath given us the whole Point; for, 1. He allows guilt to be diſtinct from Puniſhment; for *Relata are contraria affirmantia*; and it's a true notion that guilt and puniſhment are proper *relata conſtantia ex mutua alterius affectione*, and therefore diſtinct. 2. That Chriſt took upon him to bear the guilt that relates to puniſhment; it came not from the Sinner that Chriſt bore the guilt, but from God's Ordination and Chriſt's Submiſſion to law proceeding, and thence wrote *himſelf Debtor* to the Law and Juſtice of God inſtead of Sinners, and was accepted as plenary Paymaſter. 3. He owns that Sin came juſtly chargeable on him; the charge of Sin on the Sinner is that whereby he becomes guilty before God, *Rom.* 3. 19. for he that's juſtly puniſhed, is juſtly charged; as he ſaith, *charged upon him*, muſt be in a way of Law proceeding; and tho' God hath made him to confeſs the Truth in Words, yet it fully appears by his after Diſcourſe, that he believes not a word of it in *ſano ſenſu*.

§. 3. The third thing, wherein our Sins have relation to the Sufferings of Chriſt, he ſaith, *As to the perſonal Guilt of our Sins*, which he denies and decries after he had in the ſame Breath own'd Chriſt's bearing the guilt of our Sins; now he will have Chriſt to bear the guilt of our Sins, but *not the perſonal*; as if there were or could be any guilt that is not of one perſon or another; or if there were ſome generical guilt found in individual Perſons; his Exceptions are,

1. *The fault of the Sins are not laid on Chriſt.* 1. Then *its Law Relation* was not laid on Chriſt; and Chriſt being puniſhed for no fault of himſelf or others, was unjuſtly puniſhed; nay, he ſaith he was

was *justly charged*; *Is* any justly charged, when charged with no fault?

2. He excepts against saying that laying Sin upon Christ makes *Christ really a Transgressor*; but how is that said? It is in a legal Sense, not physical, therefore Christ is said to be made Sin, *viz.* Such he was not before, nor was in his own Natures, but was really accepted instead of the guilty Sinner, not Romantickly and Fabulously, the Transaction was real, according to the nature of it. As to the denial of Imputation, it's a gross Error in whoever it is, Dr. *Crisp*, or Mr. *B.* the first mistakingly denies the sense of the word, but Mr. *B.* denies the thing it self, the very Doctrine of Imputation of Sin to Christ, as the Bp. the Righteousness of Christ to us, having these invective Words.

'*As the Papists have by no means more alienated the reformed from them irreconcileably, than by obtruding as an Article of Faith, the Impossibilities and Contradictions of Transubstantiation; so some erroneous Protestants have no way Men made the Papists irreconcileable to us, than by holding forth the Impossibilities and Absurdities of imputed Righteousness, as a most necessary part of the Gospel.* Meth. Theol. Part iii. Ch. 27. Page 322.

The great Argument propounded by Dr. *Crisp* very unwarily, he not seeing how far it would run, but sufficiently improved by Mr. *B.* is this: *That God hath no other Thoughts of things than as they are.*— So doth he esteem and think of things, and consequently of Sin; in Knowledge we must distinguish between Things and Relation, and between one Relative and another. God thinks of things as they are under divers respects, God thinks and

and knows what we are by Nature; yea, the moſt eminent Believer is by Nature a Child of Wrath as well as the other; but he knows alſo what he is through Grace, what under a Covenant of Works, and what under a Covenant of Grace; Sinners in the firſt *Adam*, Righteous in the ſecond. *God calls things that are not, as though they were:* God calls *his* Son *Sin*, in a Law-ſence, who never Sinned; and a Sinner, *Righteous in Chriſt*, who never was Righteous in himſelf: He ſees him as acceptable in his ſight, he having cloathed him with his Righteouſneſs, as if he were perfectly Righteous in himſelf. God knows and ſees all things as he is Omniſcient, but yet doth not ſee reconciled Ones in their Sins, and Guilt of them, by the Eye of his Juſtice: God ſaw Chriſt under Sin by the Eye of his Juſtice, when he was under the charge of Sin, and his Perſon abſolutely conſidered moſt pleaſing to him.

It is no way inconſiſtent with the Nature of God to know what any thing is in its abſolute Being, and what it is in this or that relation; to know a Creature is a Man, and to know him to ſtand under the relation of a Father or a Son; to know what he is Naturally, and what Morally; for this is not inconſiſtent with Man's knowledge, much leſs with God's; therefore when God knows a thing, what it is in one reſpect, and calls it another; it is to be ſuppoſed that he really puts that reſpect or relation upon it; as when God calls a Man a Sinner in reſpect of the Old Covenant, and Righteous in reſpect to the New; it is to be ſuppoſed that the ſaid Perſon hath thoſe oppoſite relations really upon him firſt and laſt, and that the ſaid relations are real, and not feigned, in their reſpective way and manner of exiſting. So Chriſt Jeſus in reſpect of Sinners,

in whose stead he stood relatively, as a Surety, was made truly Sin and Curse in a Law-sense; reckon'd by God to be really in that Relation, not feignedly; And this is imputation of Sin to Christ; which term ought not to be rejected, whoever it is that makes light of it, Dr. *C.* or Mr. *B.* or any other, but most excellently expressive of the Gospel Mystery; as not imposing any thing on God but what is most consistent with his Perfections: For as God can and hath brought his Son under a Law-relation, as a Surety Mediatorial, and as such to stand instead of Sinners under a charge of Sin, for the Guilt of their Sins; he judgeth as things are, when he accounts him, and calls him what he hath made him, Sin and Curse, in this Law-respect, and relation, how pleasing soever his Person is to him, being singly and abstractly considered from the said relation.

§. 6. The Bp. excepts against the taking *of the immediate discharge of a Sinner, upon Christ's bearing of Sin.*

A. It is easie by general and indistinct charges to make Men's Opinions look very absurd, if one Man speak not so exactly in a loose and popular Discourse; are all the Drs. in the World to look upon it as their great Renown to carp at his Words, that are Printed but just as taken from him, and not Corrected by him? I think Learned Drs. do much undervalue themselves in so doing. But to the Point in Hand, it is absurd indeed to say that all Sinners have an actual discharge in themselves from the Dominion of the Law immediately upon the Death of Christ, most being not then in Being in a Natural Sense, much less in a Spiritual. But the Bp. knew well enough the distinction of the Protestants,

Proteſtants, that Redemption is conſidered in Impetration and Application; that though the Sacrifice and Propitiation of Chriſt was compleated and perfect in its ſelf, in its Nature, and to all intents and purpoſes, Juſtifying, and Pardoning, and Sanctifying Grace being fully treaſured up therein: Yet this Grace is not Applied, neither can it be Received actually by the Sinner, till, 1. He hath a Being Naturally. And, 2. Till he hath a Spiritual Being, whereto he is Created by the Spirit in Chriſt, and made capable of a Reception by a Spiritual Organ beſtowed on him. 2. He was not ignorant of this Queſtion lately diſputed, *What is the immediate Effect of the Death of Chriſt?* We ſay the great Effects of the Death of Chriſt, are two in General. 1. *A Right to Life in Chriſt.* 2. *The Application, Reception, or Poſſeſſion of the Life* purchaſed by Chriſt. The 1. *We* ſay is the *immediate Effect* of the Satisfaction and Purchaſe of Chriſt; all Redeemed Ones have a Right in Chriſt, *i. e. latent and hid in Chriſt* and his Fulneſs, even before they are or do Believe; from which Priſtine Fulneſs all received Grace doth flow; even Faith in it ſelf in us. 1. Being in the Soul, and acting on its Object; and thoſe that have this hidden Right *a jus ad rem*, yet they have not preſently *jus in re*; they have not yet received and poſſeſſed the Grace of Juſtification or Sanctification till they Believe through Grace, but are in themſelves under the Law, the Charge and Sentence thereof. This Doctrine I know Mr. *B.* Diſputes with all his might againſt, but was fully Anſwered by Dr. *O.*

§. 7. Another thing the Bp. Anſwers to, *Is on the Nature of Guilt*; that Guilt of a Sinner is moſt truly *reatus culpæ*, and not *reatus pœnæ*, *reatus*

culpæ, being that which is accounted Guilt in all Courts of Judicature.

To which he answers, there's a twofold Guilt to be considered.

1. '*Guilt of the Fact, as it is a Transgression of* '*the Law.*

2. '*A Guilt consequent to the Fact by Vertue of the* '*Sanction of the Law.* Those which are the Foundation Assertions that the Bp. builds all upon, are two. 1. That Guilt which was charged on Christ was *reatus penæ*, or Obligation to Punishment, not *reatus culpæ alicujus*, not the Guilt of any Fault, or of any Person committing it. 2. He asserts that the *Guilt of a Personal Fault can never be taken away* by Transmission, no, not by Pardon it self: Hence we are necessitated to enter the Lists with him upon these two great Points, though something hath been said before concerning them.

§. 8. We have shewed before, that the first distinction is between the *Fact, and Guilt* of the Fact: The Fact is meerly Physical, is inherent and inseparable from the Agent, not *transferrible* at all, *e. gr.* The Act of borrowing Money is inherent in the borrower, and not a Transgression of any Law; but to borrow and not to pay is a Transgression of the Law enjoined by commutative Justice. Now this is the Guilt of the Fact, when the Fact stands as a Fault in the Eye of the Legislator by the preceptive part of the Law. 1. The first Relations of an irregular Action, is to *the preceptive part of the Law*, being Disobedience. Hence it's a great mistake to place the Sanction of the Law, only in its Obligation to Punishment; this is but a part of the Sanction consequent to its *Obligation to Obedience*; therefore the primary

primary guilt of a Sinner lies in Diſobedience, his Fact ſtanding in that Relation to the Law, it becomes formally the Reaſon why the Sinner is obliged to Puniſhment, he in the ſaid relation of the Fact deſerving it.

2. The Bp. is in the right, when he ſaith, *That Obligation to Puniſhment is that which is in the Law, and only the expreſt Will of the Legiſlator*; therefore it can in no true ſenſe be called the Guilt of the Sinner: And hence I muſt needs argue, that the Bp. placing all the Guilt charged upon Chriſt, in the Laws Obligation of him to Puniſhment, doth totally renounce the Doctrine of Chriſt's being made Sin for any Sinner: For if he was not made Guilty, but only Puniſhed, he bore only the Law's Obligation, which muſt be only the Sin of the Law, and not of the Sinner. But is the Law Sin? God forbid. Yet this Doctrine plainly makes the Law Sin, becauſe it obligeth a Perſon to Puniſhment who in no ſence deſerves it.

§. 9. For the overthrowing this Hypotheſis of Imputation of a Sinner's Guilt of Fact to Jeſus Chriſt, he examines how far guilt is ſeparable from the Act of Sin, *p.* 87.

'1. *As to the Guilt of the Fact; for he that hath* 'been an actual tranſgreſſor can never be made not to 'have been ſo, and ſo the guilt of the Fact muſt remain.

A. But methinks a Bp. ſhould not impoſe ſuch a fallacy upon us, that every School-Boy can look through; I ſuppoſe becauſe he lookt upon us as Men very ſhallow, and of no penetration into matters. For though he that hath been an actual Tranſgreſſor cann't be ſaid not to have been, becauſe it's paſt, and cann't be made otherwiſe than that it hath

hath been: Doth it follow from this, that therefore now he is a Tranſgreſſor. His Argument doth run thus, A Man hath been an Actual Tranſgreſſor, therefore now he is, and ever will be; a Man hath been actually Sick or Poor, and therefore he is ſo now, and ever will be. It's a truth unalterable that this or that thing hath been, but it follows not that therefore it's now, and always will be ſo. It is a truth that all the Saints in Heaven have been guilty of Sin, but are they therefore ſo now? Then Heaven is full of guilty Sinners. He alledges the abſurdity of making a *Fact paſt*, not *to be paſt*; there's none aſſerts it; but that the Law may be fully ſatisfied for the obliquity of Fact, we aſſert; and in that ſenſe God is ſaid to take away our tranſgreſſions; for what is the end of Chriſt's ſatisfaction in being a Sin-offering? Is it not to ſatisfie the Juſtice of God in a Law-ſenſe, for the exorbitancy of that Fact; for unleſs this obliquity be taken away before God, the Sinner muſt be bound over to Puniſhment: And hence no Fleſh could be ſaved, but all the World muſt remain Guilty, Unjuſtified, and Unpardon'd.

§. 10. He excepts againſt conſidering Sins as Debts, *which*, he ſaith, *when once paid are no 'longer Debts; but there's difference between the guilt 'of a Fact, and contracting a Debt; for a Debt con-'ſiſts in a thing real, whoſe property may be altered 'and transferred, but in criminal matters there's 'nothing capable of being transferred which is a 'thing real, but the obliquity and guilt of the Fact, 'is a privative and perſonal thing.*

A. If Chriſt hath directed us to conſider of Sin as a Debt, ſuch conſideration is moſt regular and juſtifiable. 2. If Obedience be that which is due to the Law

Law of God in the ſtricteſt conſideration of Juſtice, then Diſobedience is a Debt, *erg.* Sin is a Debt. 3. If a Debt be no more a real thing, (but a Privation) then other tranſgreſſions of the Law; then the obliquity may be transferred in one as well as in another; but it is ſo, *Erg.* For a Debt is a defect of Payment, and Privation of it; there's nothing but the Payment is real. 4. In criminal matters no wrong ſubject is capable to be Puniſhed in a way of Juſtice, but he that is guilty.

§. 11. He ſaith, the Deſert *of Puniſhment which follows the tranſgreſſion, cannot be ſeparated from it.*

A. That which is meer conſequent to a thing, may be ſeparated from the Eſſential Nature of the thing, at leaſt in Conſideration; but we have ſhewed that the Deſert of Puniſhment is in the formal Nature of Sin: For Sin as ſuch is made by the Law to deſerve Puniſhment, and that is abſolutely falſe if the Scripture be true which he ſaith, ‘ *Let what Grace or Favour ſoever be ſhewed, the* ‘ *deſert of Puniſhment remains ſtill.* *A.* 1. In Man's Proceedings, a Man that is Pardon'd is taken from deſert of Puniſhment; for it's a ſlander puniſhable to call a Pardon'd Thief a Thief; and the Law is ſilenced from dealing with him as ſuch, or calling him ſo: But here God's ways are not as Man's, when he Pardons he alſo Juſtifies: He provides as well for a full ſatisfaction of his Law, for the very obliquity and exorbitancy of the Fact. But he ſaith a Privation can't be transferred. *A.* It's, true a Phyſical privation can't, but a Moral may; and a Debt may by his own Conceſſion; but a Debt is a Privation of the Creditor's Money. I wonder an Eccleſiaſtical Man ſhould not know it as well as others, unleſs they

they call Men Debtors that owe them nothing. Again, the B. saith, '*No Sinner can deserve that* '*one that was not a Sinner should suffer for his faults.* *A.* It is true, no Sinner can deserve that Christ should suffer for him, no, nor any ordinary Principal Debtor can deserve that any Man should be his Surety; but another in kindness to him may put himself under Obligation to Pay, and Write himself Debtor in his stead; so tho' Sinners deserved Punishment, yet not that Christ should be Punished for them; and therefore that Christ is punished for their Sins, flows from the love of God, and kindness of the Lord Jesus, from which he putting himself under Law-Proceedings, and Suffers in a way of Justice for Sin, *i. e.* taking upon him the Deserts of Man's Sin. 'Bp *Nor can the Law, or* '*Act of any Person, transfer the desert of Punish-* '*ment from him that was the actual Transgressor.* *A.* Here's miserable Divinity, it's time sure to come to our Litany, Lord have Mercy upon us. *A.* 1. Cann't a Law transfer a deserved Punishment to another that fully satisfies it? Why doth any one fully satisfie the Law for another, but that the Law should have nothing to say to him, to Charge or Accuse him; which if so, his desert is taken away. If a Child or Wife commit a great Theft, doth not the Guilt in Law fall on the Father or Husband; and is not the Personal Desert taken away by the Father or Husband's satisfying the Law. 2. Can no Person? Cann't God transfer the Guilt? It's strange that the Scripture should be so mistaken in saying *Jehovah* laid upon him the Iniquities of us all. All the Answers to this are so frivolous, that they are not worth our trouble of Answering them.

§. 12. Bp

§. 12. B. *The Turpitude as to the Act of Sin cann't be re moved from it.* *A.* All theſe things being inſeparable, Sin remains in the beſt, yea, glorified Saints; for Perſonal Guilt remaining and a Turpitude inſeparable, as it muſt needs ſo long as Perſonal Guilt remains, there can be no Sanctified one on Earth or Heaven; for Guilt and Filth is permanent ever, never to be removed according to this Doctrine.

'Bp *Where-ever the Act of Sin is, it muſt be* '*diſpleaſing to God, but the Turpitude, as it affects* '*the Perſon of a Sinner, muſt have another conſide-* '*ration.* *A.* Is Sin diſpleaſing to God? And can the Sinner be pleaſing to him ſo long as he lies under the fault of Sin, the deſert and guilt thereof? For ſuppoſe he is taken off from Puniſhment, can he be received into favour with God? Doth God accept Sinners in all their Guilt and Turpitude? 2. I underſtand not how Turpitude of Sin, is diſtinguiſh'd from the Gnilt of Sin, the ſaid Guilt being the Turpitude the Law finds, puniſheth for it, and condemns it, even in Man's Law: And although Sin carries an inherent Privation of good, and an internal pravity; yet there's none of this that hath not perſonal guilt in it which is ἀνομία, and ſo far at leaſt was charged on Chriſt; and ſo far a believer waſhed in the Blood of Chriſt, is purged from all his Sins, and is perfectly Righteous in the ſight of God in Chriſt, (though not in himſelf,) notwithſtanding all the inherency of remaining corruption in him, after he is partaker of Regenerating and Sanctifying Grace.

'Bp *For God may ſee cauſe to forgive a Sinner,* '*and receive him into favour, although he ſtill* '*continues to hate and abhor the Sin.* *A.* What cauſe can God have to forgive a Sinner, and receive

him into favour, besides his Free-Grace, and the Satisfaction of his Son which he hath made to his Justice, in bearing his Sin, and suffering for it? And this God doth, and yet hates and abhors Sin; for though Christ bore Sin, it was not in kindness to it, but to condemn it in his Flesh: And though God loves and saves the Person of the Sinner, yet he always hated Sin, both of the Elect and Reprobate.

§. 13. Bp *As to the Guilt of Sin, as it relates to Punishment, these things are to be considered.* He should have told us what Guilt of Sin he means, for obligation to Punishment, he told us is in the Law, not in the Delinquent, therefore his Guilt is not of Sin, but of the Law. I have not much to say to the three particulars, provided they be rightly meant, *viz.* '1. *Although a Divine Justice require satisfaction for Sin, it is not necessary the actual Transgressors should undergo the Punishment which they have deserved.* [*i. e.* if another undergo their deserved Punishment by a substitution legally in their stead in regard of Desert and Punishment] for then there would be no room for Grace and Favour [which is not shewed by God to any absolutely in a dispensation, with Justice] but in such a *way as may glorifie Divine Justice.* '2. *That it is consistent with the Wisdom and Justice of God, to accept of a Mediator* [such an one as is a Surety] *to interpose between the Severity of the Law, and the Punishment of the Transgressor, upon terms agreeable to Divine Wisdom and Mercy.* *A.* 1. The Mediator ought to be between God and Man, in respect of Sin especially, the cause of Punishment; for it's Sin that's contrary to God's Law, Punishment of the Sinner is agreeable to God's

God's Law. 2. He ſpeaks of terms upon which God accepted of a Mediator; I cannot underſtand what he means by it, for Chriſt's Mediatorſhip was the condition of God's acceptance of us. Chriſt, in reſpect of himſelf, was abſolutely accepted, not upon any previous conditions performed by him, or after-conditions to be performed by us: Which latter I find he intends. '3. *That ſuch a Mediator* '*undertaking to make Atonement for our Sins, by* '*Suffering in our ſtead and Place,* [as Sinners] '*may truly and properly be ſaid to undergo the* '*Puniſhment of our Sins; and our Sins to be the* '*Meritorious cauſe of it.* [By no means in Suffering only upon an occaſional remote reaſon from Sin; but he muſt ſuffer judicially, taking upon him a Legal Charge of Merit and Deſert in the place and ſtead of the Sinner.

Now he ſeems to ſuſpect himſelf in this Doctrine of his to fall upon the Shelves of marvellous inconſiſtency, and therefore indeavours to foreſtall the following Objection.

'*If Deſert adhere to Perſonal Guilt,* [inſepara-'bly as before aſſerted] *how can our Sins be the* '*Meritorious cauſe of another's Puniſhment?* The Argument againſt his Doctrine he can't Anſwer, for where there's *no Guilt, there's no Deſert*; and where there's *no Deſert, there's no Puniſhment in legal Senſe.* He riggles up and down under the preſſure of this Objection, but can't get it off.

'*I anſwer, that a meritorious cauſe may be con-*'*ſidered two ways.* 1. *In a Natural Courſe of* '*things; and ſo Deſert follows the Fact, ſo that* '*the Sinner always deſerves Puniſhment, and no* '*interpoſition, nor forgiveneſs, can take off the* '*Deſert,* &c. *A.* The ſubject Act to Sin is Natu-

ral, but the formal Nature of Sin, as Guilt, is Moral, as it ſtands in Relation to the Law: So that ſuppoſing that *Ordine naturæ*, the Guilt or Deſert follows the Fact, yet it's not in a Phyſical courſe of things. 2. His after Aſſertion implies that no Sin is pardoned in and through the Satisfaction of Chriſt, that whether the Sin be Pardon'd in a way of Grace, or ſatisfied for in a way of Juſtice, the Sin remains in its full ſtrength upon the Sinner for ever; for he that deſerves Puniſhment doth ſo by the Law, for the ſtrength of Sin is the Law, and therefore muſt of neceſſity, for fear of Death, the Wages of Sin, be all the Day long ſubject unto Bondage; this is a ſad Goſpel.

2. He ſaith, 'As *Deſert implies only a juſt* 'reaſon of *Puniſhment*, and *ſo there may be a Me-* 'ritorious cauſe *in extraordinary Caſes*, when the 'Legiſlator *conſents that another bear the Puniſh-* 'ment which *others have deſerved*, *Immerito quemq;* 'punire *eſt injuſte punire*, as *Johnſ.* out of *Cret.* 'Immerito *is* Ἀλόγως, *merito* ἐκλόγως *& in* Cic. 'Jure *& merito*, *are moſt commonly put together.* *A.* Here we have the cauſe given. The Queſtion is in plain terms, whether Chriſt Died *merito* for our Sins? He here plainly grants thoſe things, 1. That Deſert implies a juſt reaſon of Puniſhment; then I argue, if Chriſt was puniſhed juſtly, then he Died with a juſt reaſon thereof; and there can be no juſt reaſon of Puniſhment, but Deſert; and if this was on Chriſt, it came from Chriſt's own Perſonal Sins, or from ours: The Bp would not ſay from his, therefore from ours. 2. He grants there may be a meritorious Cauſe in extraordinary Caſes, when the Legiſlator conſents that another ſhall undergo the Puniſhment: What's that? 1. Was any Caſe

Caſe more extraordinary than this we are ſpeaking of? 2. He muſt needs mean, that when the Legiſlator conſents that another ſhall undergo the Puniſhment, that then the ſaid Perſon ſo undergoing, ſtands under the Deſert of that Perſon for whom he is puniſhed. 3. He grants the truth, and none can deny it, that *Immerito aliquem punire eſt injuſte punire*, it is ἀλόγως *punire ſine ratione in juditio.* Nothing of Suffering can be reaſonable in Judicial Proceedings, unleſs there be a deſert, therefore he ſaith that *Cic.* puts *jure & merito* together. Now this is the Myſtery that the Bp is to reveal to ſhew how Chriſt was Puniſhed for a meritorious Cauſe, and yet ſtood not under any of our Perſonal Deſerts.

§. 14. He comes now to Anſwer what is ſaid for Chriſt's bearing our Perſonal Guilt; and the moſt that he ſaith is, to reſay what he ſaid before, and is ſufficiently Anſwered already; but to do him right, we will briefly weigh his ſtrength: The firſt is, *The injuſtice of Puniſhing any* immerito; this is the ſumm of it. His Anſwer lyes chiefly in aſſerting that this is the *Socinian way of Arguing*; *and ſo we ſee the Antinomians join with the Socinians.* But how the ſame way of Arguing? May not one and the ſame medium be uſed truly and falſly? How is it the ſame way of Arguing? Two Ships may Sail two contrary ways with one and the ſame Wind; but that Anſwer which overthrows the Socinian, muſt overthrow the Neonom. For the Poſition is true, and will be granted on all hands. The Queſtion between the Socin. and Antinom. is, whether Chriſt Died *merito.* No, ſaith the Socin. becauſe he was an innocent Perſon in himſelf: The Antinom. (as he calls in this, all Calviniſts) ſaith he Died *merito*; not upon the merits of his own

own Sins, but under the merits of ours, in whoſe ſtead he Died: Now comes in the Neonom. and ſays he was puniſhed, but not for any Perſonal Deſert of himſelf or ours. Let the Candid Reader judge now, who is the Socinian; this is enough to ſhew his unfairneſs in this matter; and what he talks after to this matter, is but repeating over and over what hath been brought to the teſt, and found very weak; but tells us ſtill, that what he ſaith is very *agreeable to the Natural Senſe of Men's Minds*, [he ſhould have ſaid to the Natural Man that knows little of the Spirit] *if they would allow themſelves the liberty of thinking*; [yea, of thinking themſelves out of Scripture or any rational Underſtanding] and therefore I am aware ſtill that Neon. are the moſt thinking Men in their own conceits in the World, though I find none more abuſive and unfair in Argumentation.

§. 15. Bp. But *do we not by this means take away the proper Puniſhment of Chriſt for Sins, and ſo overthrow the Doctrine of Satisfaction.* *A.* I ſay you certainly do. For, 1. How can you ſay Chriſt was properly Puniſhed, is it for ſuch thinking Men as you are? That any Puniſhment is proper Puniſhment, which is not deſerved Puniſhment. 2. How is it poſſible that you ſay, that that Puniſhment is Satisfactory to God's Law, which is not for the Sins which break the Law. But the Bp ſaith no, ☞ *For I take away nothing but the Puniſhment that follows Perſonal Guilt, and if this be not taken away, the Antinom. Senſe muſt be allowed.* *A.* Say you ſo, ſtand aſide all Proteſtants, your Houſe is coming down on your Heads: Well, we come upon this *Dilemma*, you muſt either deny that

that ever Chriſt bore any deſerved Puniſhment, or be Antinom.

I am ſorry to ſee that my late eſteemed Friend Mr. *L.* gave occaſion to ſuch rebukes which he hath received in the Anſwer to his Appeal; that in a fixed Enmity to Dr. *C.* he condemned Chriſt's bearing the Perſonal Guilt of our Sins, as falſe, blaſphemous, and impoſſible; whereas he declares it as the Opinion he contended for, '*That the Lord Jeſus* '*Chriſt voluntarily, on the Father's invitation,* '*coming under the Sanction of the violated Law,* '*was juſtly charged with the Guilt of our Sin;* '*found Guilty, Condemned, Sentenc'd, and Execu-*'*ted as ſuch, even by that God which laid on him* '*the Iniquity of us all.* Now the words of the Bp are theſe, '*If I do not miſunderſtand, both* '*Dr. C. and you, you ſay as much in conſequence* '*as he, — And therefore you cannot diſown the* '*transferring Perſonal Guilt upon Chriſt.* This he ſufficiently proves, and I cann't but ſubſcribe to the truth of the Biſhop's Judgment in this matter; for this is a fault and a great inconſiſtency, which I always diſliked, to inveigh againſt ſome as Erroneous, and yet ſaying thoſe very things which they ſpake.

'*For as the Bp ſaith, What Guilt of our Sins could* '*be charged on Chriſt; if not the Perſonal Guilt?* '&c. See p. 28, 99, 100. *I forbear repeating more* '*in Honour to my Deceaſed Friend.* It is good to own and defend truth as truth, without reſpect of Perſons.

§. 16. The ſecond propoſed by the Biſhop for Anſwer is,

That without this tranſlation of Perſonal Guilt, no advantage could come to us by Chriſt's Suffer-

ings

ings, because a Man suffers only for his own fault, unless the fault of another be laid upon. The Argument hath great force in it: For, 1. Without translation of our Guilt upon another, either a guilty Person must Die in his Guilt, *i. e.* in his Sins, or he must be absolutely Pardon'd without satisfaction; in both these there can be no Benefit by Christ's Sufferings. 2. Another Person's Sufferings will not profit me, unless it be in my room or stead, and taken upon that Law-defect that belonged unto me. In Answer he saith, '*Here is no question but our Iniquities were laid on Christ, and that he Suffered in our stead; but the Dispute is about the manner how, whether our very Transgressions themselves were laid upon him, and how it doth appear that we cann't receive the Benefits of Christ's Sufferings, unless that were done, which is suppos'd to be done. It is a great Argument with them, our Sins are Debts, and they are reckon'd to Christ as our Surety: To shew how little force there is in it, we need only these Considerations; 1. That there is no sufficient ground for it in Scripture; as for that of* Isa. 53. 6. *there is not the least ground for it in the Text; for the words properly signifie that he made our Iniquities meet, and to fall upon him,* i. e. *as a Man falls upon his Enemy when he meets him: So the Jewish Interpreters.*

But doth this Man say enough to take off the force of this place of Scripture? 1. He tells us that the meaning is he made our Sins to meet upon him; the words are here, *Jehovah* made the Iniquities of us all to fall upon him, the word is, עין what is that but Iniquity? Is it ever taken for Sacrifice for Sin? Who made them to meet? *Jehovah* the Legislator, God the Judge of all, and how

can

can Iniquities of many meet on one Perſon? Can it be any way but judicially? As the Perſon is a Surety, chargeable and charged with the guilt of many. But ſee what a Sence he would ſham off his Reader with. As a Man falls upon his Enemy when he meets him; he ſhould have ſaid, as many Enemies falls upon a Man when they meet him; for it was the Iniquities of many; but how could our Iniquities fall upon Chriſt to hurt him, if the Guilt of them fell not upon him? And why ſhould *Jehovah* make many Sins fall upon Chriſt? Was there any reaſon for it in Chriſt, or us, or in the Juſtice of God, to ſet ſuch Millions of Maſtiff Dogs on Jeſus Chriſt, on poor innocent Jeſus? Or what Deſign of Wiſdom was it, when thoſe Sins were neither to ſlay Chriſt, nor Chriſt to ſlay them? And this he tells us was the *Jews* and *Symachus* his Interpretation; he knew what Opinion the *Jews* were of concerning Chriſt, and this ſo eminent Prophelie of him; and he might have told us what his Friend *Grotius*'s Opinion was about this place; but he acquaints us how the lxx render, *He gave him up to our Iniquities*; and is not that againſt him? How could Chriſt be given up to our Iniquities? But in bearing the deſerved Puniſhments of our Sins? And *Procopius*, he ſaith, expreſſeth it by ὥσπερ ἀντίψυχον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, is not this as a Surety? And yet he ſaith here is nothing like Suretiſhip to pay our Debts for us. Now if the Bp. had pleaſed to read out the Chapter, he might have ſeen two Verſes more, wherein this Truth is litterally expreſs; *V.* 11. *He ſhall bear their Iniquities*, וְסֵבֶל, he ſhall take their Iniquities as a Burden on his Shoulders to carry them away, as the Scape-Goat did the Iniquities of the Children of *Iſrael:* And the lxx renders

it τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει, He ſhall take up their Iniquities upon him. And *V.* 12. חטא רבים נשא, He ſhall bear the Sin of many; ſhall the Spirit of God expreſs it ſelf to one thing ſo fully and plainly, and all fly away at the Puff of a Bp. as Chaff before the Wind? What is all that this learned Bp. hath ſaid to refute this Doctrine of Chriſt's bearing our Sins, and ſatisfying for them as our Debts to Divine Juſtice, but this? Here's *nothing like Chriſt's Suretiſhip to pay our Debts for us*, we will not take his Word for it, till he proves that Sin is not a Debt to the Law of God, when Chriſt hath told us it is. 2. Till he ſhews any other credible way of bearing another's Faults, beſides this way of Suretiſhip; till, 3*dly*, He ſhews and proves againſt the Apoſtle *Peter*, that there is no other way of paying Debts, on purchaſing or redeeming, than with plain Silver and Gold.

§. 17. He proceeds to ſhew us the *great Harm* of Chriſt's being a Surety to pay our Debts of Sin, *p.* 107. 1. Then Chriſt hath *fully diſcharged our Debts already.* This is one *Miſchief of it*, but God forbid it ſhould that Chriſt ſhould do Harm in paying any Man's Debts; but to do it by halves is to pay ſome only, and leave others for us to pay. How did he ſatisfie God's Juſtice if he gave not full Satisfaction? God forbid that Chriſt ſhould leave a Farthing for us to pay. 2. ‘ *The ſecond Miſchief* ‘ *is, that we have nothing to do towards the Payment* ‘ *of our Debt; all that we have to do is to believe,* ‘ *and to be thankful; for all this Tranſaction was* ‘ *long ſince paſt without Conſideration of any Act on* ‘ *our parts.* *A.* Is it a Harm that Chriſt hath done ſo much for us in way of Satisfaction and Purchaſe? that he hath left nothing of ours to put in for a Share

Share in this Honour; no, not our believing it ſelf. I take it to be the Glory of Chriſt, and the bleſſed Priviledge of Believers, that he hath provided for Believers ſuch a Furniture of Grace, that they ſhall believe on him, bear his Image, walk in his Steps, to the Glory of his Name, in all Thankfulneſs, and new Obedience. 'The *third Miſchief is, that* 'it *nulls all Fœderal Conditions on our part*; but 'of this, more afterward. 4. 'That *we can't ſuf-* 'fer *for thoſe Sins that are already diſcharged.* Is this ſuch a Harm? It's neither Reaſon or Juſtice that we ſhould pay a Debt to the Law which is already diſcharged; Chriſt hath born all the Sins of Believers in the deſerved Puniſhments thereof; hence the Sufferings of the Saints are not Penal, nor can be, but are Bleſſings for their Good, purchaſed by Chriſt for them.

§. 18. The Bp. ſaith, 'There's *but one place of* 'Scripture *to be found to favour this Senſe of the* 'Suretiſhip *of Chriſt*, viz. *Heb.* 7. 22. It is eaſie to inſtance in many places that favour it, and prove it, it being, as I may ſay, the very Marrow of the Goſpel; but as to this place, it expreſly calls Chriſt a Surety; and it is the more remarkable, as to our preſent purpoſe, that as the Spirit of God hath called Sins Debts, and Chriſt's Suffering a Price paid, and expreſly excluding Payment by Silver or Gold, ſo Chriſt is called ערב, which, as *Lexicog.* ſay, doth primarily ſignifie a Surety for Money. Hence it appears, the Spirit of God makes much of the Metaphor, of Debt and Payment, to confirm our Faith in this, that there's no better account of the Nature of Sin, than a Debt to God's Juſtice; and no better account of the Sufferings of Chriſt, than that they were a Payment of this Debt to the Juſtice

of God. And what if it be but in one place of Scripture? When a Truth is so fully and plainly expressed in one Text, it is enough; there are many Truths of great weight are so, besides the marvellous Concurrence of other texts of Scripture, to the tenor thereof. But he saith, this text speaks of a Covenant, not of the Surety of a Covenant. *A.* What is it that makes a Debt is not a Covenant, or compact? But it is of a better Covenant, *i. e.* a Surety to pay the Debts of the old Covenant of Works, but brought in by a better Covenant, the new Covenant, being a Covenant of Grace, answering the Ends of God's Grace more than the old, doing that which the old could not do to save Sinners by a Righteousness which is not their own, but better, in that it hath a Surety that it brings in to engage unto God to pay all our Debts due to the Justice of God from us under the old Covenant, which had no Surety, *Heb.* 7.19. makes it better in nothing else but the bringing in a better Hope, *viz.* the Surety. But he positively denies that Christ was to pay our debts unto God. If so, what's the reason the Church prays, *Forgive us our Debts*, when God's way of Forgiveness of a Sinner, as asserted in Scripture, is by bringing in a Surety to pay his debts of Sin, *Col.* 1, 14. *In whom we have Redemption thro' his Blood, even the Forgiveness of Sins.*

But what a Surety is it that he will have Christ to be? Sure it is the same the *Socinians* will have to be only, *i. e.* a Surety to engage for God to us, not for us to God, but a Surety only for the Truth and Faithfulness of God in his Promises. See his Words, *p.* 110.

§. 18, The Bp. takes notice of some dissenting Brethren, (he might better said of Protestants dissenting

ſenting from the Church of *Rome*, *who talk much of Surety, Righteouſneſs, — and of Chriſt's being our Surety as to the Payment of our Debts, becauſe the Debtor may be ſaid to pay the Sum the Surety lays down for him, and that God doth account that Believers do pay that Debt of Obedience, which Chriſt hath paid in their Stead, becauſe they are a legal Perſon with Chriſt, and all this depends upon this miſtaken Notion of Suretiſhip.*

A. It is very ſad that ſo plain Scripture ſhould corrupt our Minds with miſtaken Notions, how ſhall we know we are miſtaken or not in any then? Or that we do know the Mind of the Spirit in them, if when we have a plain text, expreſſing a Truth according to the plain and undeniable Sence of other texts of Scripture, not only agreeing with, but eſſential to the Analogy of Faith? If we muſt look on this received Doctrine to be a miſtaken Notion, then ſurely notwithſtanding the Revelation that God hath given us in his Word, he hath left us under Chymerian Darkneſs, and inextricable Laborinths in the great Points of Life and Salvation; but what hath he to ſay againſt this received Doctrine by the diſſenting Brethren, and all true Proteſtants? '*If once* '*it be ſuppoſed that we perfectly obeyed the Law in* '*Chriſt, there can be no room for Remiſſion of Sins*; '*for how can Sins be forgiven to them that have* '*obeyed the Law?*

I cannot anſwer this Argument better than in the very Words of Mr. *R. Capel*, (whom none I ſuppoſe will call an Antinom.) in Vindication of Dr. *Twiſs*, on this Point. '*There is a double Acception of the* '*Term Remiſſion of Sins.* 1. *There is a meritori-* '*ous Juſtification, or Remiſſion of Sins, this is of* '*Sins before they are committed.* 2. *There's an* '*actual*

'*actual Justification or Remission of Sin*; *and this* '*is not till after our Sin is committed, and we do* '*believe all this*, *none of these Exceptors do or* '*can question. Those that lean much to the Doctrine* '*of* Arminius *and* Vortius *in this point, may see all* '*this expressed in clear terms by* Vortius. *So that* '*it is one thing for all the Sins of all the Elect to be* '*pardoned to Christ for them, that was done before* '*we were, or our Sins were*; *another thing to be* '*pardoned to them*; *Christ was made a Curse for* '*us by Imputation*; *for that the Father did impute* '*all our Sins as a Judge, to Christ as a Surety,* '*and did exact all of him as guilty by that Law,*— '*and this is* (*I conceive*) *all the meaning of Dr.* 'Twiss, *and is, or at least ought to be, the meaning* '*of us all*; *and this a learned Man calls a mystical* '*Justification, because all the Sins of all the Elect* '*are as laid upon Christ, so remitted unto Christ, our* '*Head and Husband*; *which Pardon and Absolution* '*he took in our Name, and keeps for our Use.*—See '*Capel of Repentance*, p. 257, 258. For Brevity-sake I shall add nothing further to the Answer of this Argument of the Bp.

§. 19. He adds, '*It doth not follow, because a* '*Debt may be transferred to a Surety*; *that our* '*Sins may be transferred to Christ*; *and his Reasons* 'are, 1. *Because Sins cannot be transferred as* '*Money*. *A.* But doth not the Spirit of God sufficiently acquaint us, that it's a moral Debt, Sin is the Debt, our owing, and not paying Obedience to the Law; and that Christ paid not Silver and Gold, 'but his Precious Blood; but he saith, '*That altho* '*the Sinner be said to owe a Debt to the Law, yet* '*that Debt lyes in an Obligation to Punishment,* '*which he is liable to by the Guilt of the Fact.*

A. Now

A. Now he owns the Sinner owes a Debt to the Law; but that's not Obedience, but Puniſhment: But believe it, Puniſhment is the Debt of the Law to the Sinner, the Wages of Sin (by the Law) is Death: But that whereby the Sinner becomes a Debtor to the Law, is his Failure, in giving due Obedience to the Preceptive Part of the Law; for its Obedience the Law doth naturally and primarily enjoin and expect from the Subject. *Puniſhment may be transferred by the Legiſlator's Conſent.* *A.* Puniſhment without Merit is but ſuffering, and not legally inflicted, and can't be done by a Legiſlator without Diſpenſing with his Law.

Object. 'This Debt ariſeth from Guilt of Fact, 'how then can any diſcharge the Debt, without 'taking the fault? I anſwer, That taking the fault 'can ſignifie no more than being anſwerable to the 'Law for it, which muſt reſpect the Debt of Pu-'niſhment. Reader, But doth not this quite overthrow all the Bp. hath been doing? For if Puniſhment (as always it is) be anſwering the Law for Sin, this always implies that the puniſhed Perſon bears the juſt Demerit of his Sin, elſe why do the Law inflict Puniſhment? It's not becauſe that Man hath not obeyed, but diſobeyed; wherein the Puniſhed is only paſſive in ſuffering, tho' active in contracting the Guilt, wherein lyes the Demerit of Puniſhment, and makes the Wages due from the Law; — *And he that takes away the Guilt of Puniſhment, doth ſatisfie the Juſtice of the Law.* *A.* The ſatisfying the Juſtice of the Law lyes in inflicting deſerved Puniſhment; for Guilt is not in the Law, as the Bp. hath ſaid, but in a Perſon whom the Law hath found guilty; therefore the Law is not ſatisfied, by afflicting in general, but afflicting ſome

ſome Perſon that is found guilty and faulty by the Law.

As to the Objection, *That nothing is the Merit of Puniſhment* but *Reatus culpæ*, he anſwers ſo little, that it's not worth our Cognizance; and that little is but a Rehearſal of what hath been replied to already.

§. 20. Bp. ‘ *Suppoſe the Fault could be transferred, as a Debt may, how comes it to paſs that upon this Tranſlation there muſt be a preſent Diſcharge?* *A.* There muſt be ſuch to him that pays the Debt, and this given to him for the Benefit and Uſe of the Priſoner when he will pleaſe to give it. Chriſt muſt be juſtified from our Sins, and diſcharged, or elſe not raiſed from bearing them; when he had ſatisfied Juſtice, all our Sins were pardoned to him; but another Act of Grace is ſhewed, in bringing home, and applying Pardon to; and therefore for diſcharging us from the Law as Priſoners of Hope, thro' what Chriſt hath fully done and ſuffered.

B. ‘ *This Doctrine tends to incourage Men to neglect, or careleſs Performance of ſtrict Obedience, which they owe to God.* *A.* This is the Objection againſt the Doctrine of the Grace of God, which Enemies to it made, and the Apoſtle *Paul* anſwers, *Rom.* 6. But the Bp. will not take his Anſwer; there he ſaith it *naturally diſpoſeth Men's Minds to a paſſive careleſs Temper, and wait for Supplies from above.* *A.* The Grace of God never enclines the Heart to ſo ill a Temper, but quite contrary, *Tit.* 2. 11, 12. It is one thing, what a Man is by Nature, and what by Grace; Men by Nature are naturally enclined to abuſe the Grace of God, but are not ſo by effectual Grace.

Bp.

Bp.---' *They depend upon Gord's working in them,* ' *to will and to do of his own good Pleaſure, with-* ' *out ſetting themſelves to work out their own Sal-* ' *vation with fear and trembling.* *A.* The Bp. ſhould have known that the Abuſe of the Grace of God is no juſt Argument againſt it; and if ſome Men do ſo, will he cenſure all as ſuch? God's working in Men to will and to do, and their working out their own Salvation, are not Contradictions, if rightly underſtood; but to ſhew us that the Grace of God is firſt in all we do, that teacheth and worketh in us to work, both to begin and continue to ſerve God with all our Might; but with Fear, leſt we ſhould give the Glory of all unto our ſelves in leaning and depending on our own Strength. The Bp. might have ſpared the reſt of his Banter, it's not worth Paper and Ink to ſpend about it.

§. 21. He makes a great Clutter againſt the diſſenting Brethren, as if in their Doctrine of the Free Grace of God, they *would allow no Conditions upon any Account*; and ſaith, *here is ſomething beyond meer Gratitude and Service, and what's that? It's a Connexion in away of Duty, and Means in order to the end, and not meer Connexion in a way of Event: ſo that thoſe to whom God will give Glory, he will give Grace to fit Perſons for it.* *A.* Hereby it's eaſie to ſee what ſtrange Monſters the Oppoſers of the Doctrine of Chriſt do ignorantly or maliciouſly repreſent the Profeſſors and Defenders thereof to be. Do they deny a firm Connexion between Grace and Glory? Do they deny the Neceſſity of Holineſs? Indeed not as *a Fœderal Condition of Happineſs, but a Condition of neceſſary Connexion*; and as he gallops along, he is pleaſed to fall upon ſome Expreſſions of mine. Some may perhaps ſay, *What is't but to*

make that Promiſe to ſecure Life upon doing of our Duties? And if this be not to make the Goſpel a more overgrown and ſwinging Covenant of Works, than ever the old Law was, I have loſt, [*not they*] *my Theological Meaſures,* Neonom. *p.* 3, and 296. Reader, Upon theſe few quoted Lines, pick'd up at a diſtance, not truly quoted neither, he makes a large Harangue about Theological Meaſures, (which Words I applied not to any but to my ſelf) and ſay [they] *The Standard of Theological Meaſures is the Scripture.* And ſo I ſay. And ſaith he, St. *Paul was as little ſuſpected of ſetting up a Covenant of Works, as any Penman in the New Teſtament.* I think ſo too. But he hath ſaid, 2 *Tim.* 1. 19. *God hath ſaved us, and called us with an holy Calling, not according to our Works,* &c. I ſubſcribe to the Apoſtles Doctrine heartily, and it's expreſly againſt the Bp's Doctrine, who would have our Works the Fœderal Condition of the Covenant of Grace, when the Apoſtle ſays, who hath called us not according to our Works; and what is the Genuine Meaning thereof, but that tho' God hath called us to Holineſs, yet it's not according to our Works, as a Covenant Condition thereof, ſo *Tit.* 3. 5. but it's the manner of theſe Men to quote Places for themſelves, which are Diametrically oppoſite to them? He makes a needleſs Sputter about working out of our Salvation, and ſaith we are told, Neon. *part* 3. and 296. *No more is meant by this than a continual maintaining a holy Jealouſie of our ſelves, leſt we ſhould fail of the Grace of God, by truſting in our ſelves,* &c. Now doth it become a Bp. to be ſo falſe, in repreſenting what he would expoſe; there's not a word of, *No more is meant by this,* but that this is meant, it may contain more; but this is every Believer's Duty laboriouſly

to

to continue in all ways of Holineſs and new Obedience, but fear and tremble in Suſpicion of his corrupt Heart, which is apt to make his Obedience Hay and Stubble, in aſcribing it to his own Strength, and in making it his Righteouſneſs for his Juſtification; and if any will rationally argue againſt this Doctrine, I am ready to defend it, as I am other Truths, which I have aſſerted that ſome have ſnarl'd and banter'd at, but have not made any fair ſhew of proving them Errors; and till they do that, I ſhall not honour them ſo far, as to blot Paper about them.

§. 22. What remains is only to draw odious Conſequences upon this Doctrine of laying our Sins on Chriſt, or his bearing the deſert of Puniſhment for our Sins. 1. *There's nothing for us to do, but only to ſit ſtill, and expect when God will work in us.* *A.* Doth the Text ſay we muſt *ſit ſtill?* Doth any one ſay ſo? But the Scripture ſaith, and the Saints have practiced, to be continually waiting upon God in the Prayer, and all the means of Grace, to work in them, *to will and to do*; and as God works it in them, he works them to it, knowing that of themſelves they are not *able to think a good Thought*; but herein being enabled by Divine Aſſiſtance to do a good Work, they muſt keep a Watch over their own Hearts, that they rob not God of the Glory of his Efficiency, and take it to themſelves. Bp. Paul *gives another Senſe when he perſwades rich Men to do Good*, 1 *Tim.* 6. 18. How another Senſe? Doth not the Grace of God perſwade and teach Men to do good Works? Doth not the ſame Apoſtle tell us, that the Grace of God, that brings *Salvation, teach Men to deny Ungodlineſs, and to live holily*, &c. Again, *Is laying hold of Eternal Life by*

good Works a ſwingeing Covenant of Works? No, who ſaid ſo? But there's a twofold laying hold of a thing; one is by way of *Right*; that is, not in our Works themſelves, but in Chriſt; and a laying hold by way of *Participation and Poſſeſſion*; that is, an effect of the Covenant right in Chriſt; and ſo all Believers by the exerciſe of Faith and Holineſs, are continually maintaining their hold of Chriſt and Eternal Life, given them in Chriſt; and the Theological Meaſure holds here, that *Paul* hath not by this Text thrown down what he taught of the Efficacy of the Grace of God, but only proſecutes that Doctrine; that where it brings Salvation, it teacheth Men to do good Works; therefore he exhorts *Timothy* to teach by the Word what God's Grace works by the Word and Spirit, neither doth he accommodate himſelf to rich Men, as if he intended they ſhould be ſaved in a Covenant of Works, which would be no better than Bargain and Sale of Eternal Life.

Bp. ---- *The Foundation of the Covenant it ſelf was certainly nothing but the Grace of God thro' Chriſt.* *A.* Foundation here's very ambiguous; I know the Neonom. and Papiſts, and all will ſay ſo, when they ſay Chriſt purchaſed the Covenant of Grace, *i. e.* the new Law, and deny him to be the Condition of it; and therefore he ſpeaks always in their Dialect cunningly; — *yea, and the Foundation of our Hopes as to our obtaining the Benefits.* *A.* If ſo then, how is Chriſt the Foundation of ſuch Hopes? Is it not Chriſt believed in, as the great Obtainer of Right to Eternal Life, and the great Beſtower of effectual Grace; for without this Faith there can be no Hope, nor any purifying our ſelf, as he is pure.

§. 23.---*Not as Works meritorious of a Reward,* [ſo ſay the Socinians too] *but as Means which God hath appointed in order to an end.* *A.* I pray who denies all this of the Calveniſts? All which he calls Antin. but doth he not trip up his own Heels by this Conceſſion? I ſay, and I am ſure can prove, that the Condition of a Covenant compact, let the thing required be little or more, it's meritorious of the covenant Reward promiſed, and is *meritum expacto*; now then if he concede that our Works are not meritorious of a Reward, he gives us all we contend for, provided he yeild that the Condition of a Covenant compact is meritorious of theReward, which all Men of Senſe will acknowledge; well then, what Place [after all this noiſe] is Works to have? He ſaith, *They are only Means which God hath appointed in order to an end.* *A.* If this be rightly meant,we will grant it, and yet hold our Aſſertion untouch'd; for tho' all Fœderal Conditions are Means, yet all Means are not Covenant Conditions; antecedent things are Means of coming to conſequent, but not always Fœderal Conditions. Now if he will ſay eternal Life is that end, I will ſay more, that he hath not Eternal Life who hath not ſuch a Faith, which hath its Fruits unto Holineſs; and that this Holy Life belongs to,and is that Eternal Life begun in us. Bp. *As a Son that hath an Eſtate promiſed him of the free Gift of his Father, but yet he requires ſome Conditions to be performed by him before he comes to the Poſſeſſion of it; can any one think this to be Bargain and Sale between Father and Son.* A. *The Compariſon is too ſhort to illuſtrate, much leſs to prove the thing.* For, 1. In this the Father will not enjoin any Conditions but ſuch as the Son hath Ability to perform. As for Example; He will not enjoin

join a poor lame Cripple to leap over a Hedge firſt, nor a Stone-blind illiterate Son to read a Chapter in the Hebrew Bible. Now to ſay that our Caſe runs parallel, it's falſe; for if God promiſe Eternal Life upon the condition of our good Works, who are dead in Treſpaſſes and Sins, it's to do it on an unperformable condition; which becometh not the Wiſdom of God. 2. And he ſaith, *Can any one think this to be Bargain and Sale? A.* Yes ſure, there are ſuch Fools in the World. If all be ſo who believe not as the Bp. ſaith, I would ask the Bp. if his Father ſhould tell him, Child, if thou wilt reſign up thy Biſhoprick of *Worceſter* to thy Brother, I will give thee the Biſhoprick of *Durham*, would not the Bp. demand the Biſhoprick of *Durham* as due to him from his Father upon his Reſignation, let the Father be *Pater Patriæ*, the King, or any other?

§. 24. Now he ſaith, *If theſe be Theological Meaſures, they had need to ſeek for new ones.* No ſure, for the Bp. hath ſaved us that Labour, he hath found them for us; but ſuch as are but Traſh by the Standard of Scripture and Reaſon. Now he reckons he hath paid off Theological Meaſures, but ſaith, he hath not yet done with them. *Sure we may moſt ſafely take our Theological Meaſures from our Saviour*, [yes ſurely, there's no doubt of it] *for he knew beſt how far, and in what Senſe the Guilt of our Sins was transferred upon him, and whether there followed an immediate Diſcharge upon it, without regard to Conditions on our parts; the Queſtion of the higheſt Import being put to him, what ſhall I do to inherit Eternal Life? A.* Where lyes the Force of this Argument? It muſt be here: If Chriſt had this Queſtion twice put to him, *What ſhall I do to inherit Eternal Life?* And his Anſwer was, *Keep*

the

the Commandments, and thou ſhalt live; then the Guilt of our Sins were not laid on Chriſt [*non ſequitur*] ſo he ſaith, as to him, *Luke* 10. 25, 28. *Had our Saviour only a mind to banter him?* No, what was it then? He himſelf tells us, *It was to convince him of the Impoſſibility of his doing what was neceſſary for Eternal Life.* He ſhould have added under the Covenant of Works; and therefore of performing a Covenant Condition anſwerable to the Covenant of Works, whereby the *Jews* expected a merited Reward, they ſought Life by the Righteouſneſs of the Law; and he acknowledgeth, *That it is not improbable that our Lord intended to convince him of his Folly, who ſuppoſeth he had kept thoſe Commandments in the Jewiſh Sence of them.* And this is the true meaning of the Text, why therefore is this Text brought to prove that Chriſt bore not the Guilt of Sins? *Baculus ſtat in Angulo ergo pluit.* There's as little conſequence from the other, *Mark* 10. 17. The ſame or like Anſwer may ſerve, which he ſuggeſts himſelf. *There was an immoderate Love to the World in his Heart, which he was not aware of till our Saviour put him upon a ſevere Trial of himſelf, Go ſell what thou haſt,* &c. Upon this Trial he ſhewed himſelf, and went away ſorrowful, notwithſtanding all his ſeeming Deſire for Heaven, this was the true Reaſon, and no other; and Chriſt intended not thereby to eſtabliſh a Covenant of Works; and what he ſaith after is to little purpoſe; it's only to wreſt the Senſe of a Text from what he thought in his Conſcience it would bear. And ſo *Luke* 16. 9. *Make to your ſelf Friends of the Mammon.* What, doth he ſay of that? *Not by way of Merit, or any fooliſh Imagination of that ſort, but in Obedience to the Will of God, who hath made*

made it a neceſſary Duty. Do they ſpeak otherwiſe who hold Chriſt bore their Perſonal Guilt? I wonder a Bp. ſhould trifle ſo ſhamefully. Again, he ſaith, *If theſe be Theological Meaſures, what doth our Saviour mean,* when he ſaith, *Luke* 13. 24. *Strive to enter?* &c. *A.* He means, not that he did not bear the Guilt of Sin, or any ſhould ſtrive in his own Strength, or ſtrive as a Fœderal Condition; for he ſaith, *Many ſhall ſtrive,* [*i. e.* falſly in ſuch a manner,] *and ſhall not be able*; and who interprets ſtriving here, of faint and weak Endeavours? Certainly he would render all them that holds that Chriſt bore the Guilt of Sin to be a pitiful ſort of Chriſtians, that have little or no regard to the Command of Chriſt. Sure, if they were ſo, they would not many of them ſo joyfully have ſuffered the ſpoiling of their Goods by the Biſhops in the late time of Perſecution; and what led them to it but a Conſcience of Obedience to the Commands of Chriſt?

He ſaith, One would think it impoſſible to enter into a Man's Head, to ſuppoſe that *a Man's own Righteouſneſs ſhould be excluded from being conjunct with the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, if he look to* V. 21, and 24. *A.* Chriſt doth not in the leaſt oppoſe Man's Righteouſneſs to his, nor make it conjunct with his, but gives only a Character of ſuch as be ſincere Believers and Profeſſors of his Name, and will be found ſo at the laſt Day.

What he ſays of immediate Diſcharge hath been ſpoken to before, that the immediate Effect of Chriſt's Death was a Right to a Diſcharge; the Diſcharge it ſelf could not be before they have a Natural and Spiritual Being.

§. 25.

§. 25. Bp. If there be *no condition, how can they be ſatisfied that the Guilt of their Sins are laid on Chriſt? A.* In anſwer to this it's ſaid, believe with all thy Heart, *&c.* that muſt be a real receiving of Chriſt: He that hath the Son hath Life, 1 *John* 5. 11, 12. The Sinner firſt receives Chriſt, after ſees and knows he hath received Chriſt himſelf, V. 13, and 20. And we own there may be preſumption, where there's an appearance of believing and knowing, only there need not be ſuch ſputter as he makes about theſe matters, neither doth it profit his cauſe.

Object. But *while we were Sinners Chriſt Died for us*; ſo ſaith the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 5. and others after him: Two things thereby ſignified, 1. That Chriſt Died for us under that Conſideration, for he came not to Save thoſe that are Righteous, but thoſe that were Sinners. 2. That it was long ago that Chriſt Died while we were in the firſt *Adam*, and in an unregenerate ſtate, Sinners of the Gentiles; to which he rejoins thus, *How then muſt every Sinner believe that Chriſt Died for him? A.* Every Sinner under the Call of the Goſpel, is to believe in Chriſt for Life and Salvation, according to the conſtant tenor of the Goſpel; but to know Chriſt did bear his Sins, and die for him, reſults from this Believing. He that hath the Son, *i. e.* by believing, hath Life. Receiving is firſt before knowing that a Man hath Received; and it is Goſpel truth, that Chriſt bore the Sins of every one that truly believes; and every one is an Elect Perſon, whoſe Sins Chriſt bore: For if the Apoſtle ſpake true, he that makes ſure his Calling, makes ſure his Election. —*Then ſaith the Bp. here is Univerſal Redemption aſſerted in its full extent; and what is more, here is Uni-*

versal Election too; if all Men can believe that their Sins are forgiven. *A.* Let us examine the Bp's fallacious Arguing. 1. The Gospel is indefinitely preached to all under the Call thereof, and directed to all Sinners without any exception; he that believes on the Lord Jesus, shall be saved; is this an Argument that Redemption is Universal, or that all are Saved, or Elected: It's said as many as were Ordained unto Life believed, therefore it cann't be said that every one doth or can believe, *John* 12. 39. 2. See how foully this Man imposeth by charging his opposites with saying, *That all Men can believe that their Sins are forgiven*, p. 133. or to charge this, as *p.* 132. *That a Man's Sins are forgiven because he believes that they are forgiven, being laid on Christ*; whereas a Man believes because his Sins are forgiven and laid on Christ; for Christ bearing our Sin is the Cause of believing, and not the Effect. — *At least conditional Election follows upon it he saith.* We see he suspected his first consequence, and therefore poacheth in another. This may serve for a Professed Armin. but the Bp. I suppose would not have been accounted so; the Argument is, because Men are Saved in and by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, therefore Election is upon foresight of Faith; but we say Men are as absolutely Elected unto Faith as unto Glory: The controversie of Conditional Election is not here to be entered upon, but we assert that it follows more upon the Bp's Hypothesis than ours.

§. 26. *He adds, its ground enough of presumption as to all such as can believe that their Sins are forgiven.* *A.* Those that can believe their Sins are forgiven, can believe through the Grace of God working it; nay, they have attained to a great measure

ſure of Grace; How doth preſumption conſiſt with, *can Believe?*

B. *What can hinder any Man more from Repentance, and forſaking his Sins, than to be told that the firſt Act of Saving Faith, is to believe his Sins is forgiven?*

R. Where is any one that will teach an Unbeliever, to Believe his Sins are forgiven in the ſtate of Unbelief? But we find the Voice of the Goſpel to the Unbeliever, is to invite and call him to believe the Goſpel; which ſaith, that this is a Saying worthy of all acceptation, That Chriſt came into the World to ſave Sinners; that he bore Man's Sin, and was made Sin and Curſe for them, and that the Sinner ſhould come in particular and apply himſelf to Chriſt for this Pardon and Forgiveneſs that is in Chriſt; for with him is Pardon and Plentiful Redemption. He is a Fountain opened for Sin and Uncleanneſs, and if a Fountain, then not an empty Object of Faith, but full of Pardon, and of all the Grounds and Reaſons of a Sinner's Faith and Hope. Now how doth ſuch coming to Chriſt, and cloſing with him in a free Promiſe, hinder Repentance, and embolden them unto Sin? For the Apoſtle ſaith, Sin ſhall not have Dominion over you, becauſe you are under the Grace of God in the Promiſe; and he ſhews Sin will reign over a Man while he is under the Law.

— *But the Goſpel Preacheth Repentance in order to Remiſſion.*

R. It Preacheth Repentance and Remiſſion, to ſhew, that where there is Repentance to Life there is Remiſſion; and where there is Remiſſion received by Faith, there will be Repentance in a Believing, coming to God through Chriſt. The Soul cann't turn from Sin to God, but by a believing

Repentance, neither can any Repentance be unto Life, unless it be a turning from Sin to God thro' Jesus Christ. Hence Faith and Repentance are frequently put for one another, or in one the other included. When the Scripture speaks of the first Act of the Sinners coming unto God, yea, not only the first act of true Faith, but all other are inseparable from Repentance, as from other Graces, Love, Hope, *&c.* Though both Repentance, Love, and Hope, are distinct Graces and Fruits of the Spirit from Faith, and from each other. This, lastly, I affirm, as the truth of the Gospel, that there can be no true Repentance antecedent in Nature to true Faith, Faith being the first effect of Spiritual Life in one that is effectually called. Bp *Repentance is commanded, and Baptism commanded, therefore they are conditions.* R. The Antecedent is true, but the consequence follows not, if he meant new Covenant Conditions. For all things, and Duties Commanded are not therefore fœderal Conditions: For that Grace which God works by his Word and Spirit, is very absurdly called a Condition of a Covenant that God makes with a Sinner. But observe, he makes Repentance such a condition as Baptism; if so, what inseparable connection is there (as there should be in this Case) between the condition and promise; for will any say that he that is not Baptized shall be Damn'd? The Scripture saith not so, besides the Seal of a Bond is not the Condition of the Obligation, but only a Ratification.

Whether Mr. R. B. *did Socinianize.*

The Chief thing discussed by the Bp in his third Chapter, is whether Mr. *B.* was a Socinian, from which Charge he makes as if he would Vindicate him; I shall briefly

briefly examine how he acquits himſelf in this difficult undertaking. The ſum and ſubſtance of Mr. *B*'s Opinion in this Point was, *That our Sins were no proper meritorious Cauſe of Chriſt's Sufferings, they were only premeritorious or occaſional Cauſes.* For although the Bp would have Mr. *B.* mean ſomething more than occaſional, by premeritorious, yet he acquits us with Mr. *B*'s own Explication of his meaning of premeritorious, that it is only occaſional, which the Bp ſaith is no cauſe at all, and Socinianiſm; and yet he, good Man, would defend him, though he finds it *hic labor hoc opus*, and fain to leave it *re infecta.*

The firſt proof which he would make is from Mr. *B*'s Confeſſion, wherein all that he ſaith is no more than what a Socinian will ſay in this Point, *That Chriſt gave up himſelf a Sacrifice for our Sins, and a Ranſom for us, in ſuffering for us upon the Croſs*; which he doth make (according to his way of moulding of Doctrine) comport well enough with Socinian Principles. See what he gives for Antinomianiſm. 1. *That Chriſt ſatisfied God's Juſtice as in the Perſon of all the Elect*, this one Error, whereby he denies Jeſus Chriſt to be *a Publick Perſon.* 2. *That in a Law-ſence, and God's account, they themſelves did ſatisfie in and by Chriſt.* Here he denies Chriſt to have Suffered in our ſtead, or to have made Payment to Juſtice for our Sins, either in a Law-ſenſe, nor in God's account; and therefore he made no payment for us, neither *can we ſay we ſatisfie in and by him:* Whereas every Debtor can ſay ſo, who hath a Surety that makes payment in his ſtead, the Law accounting this payment to the Original Debtor; neither is it untrue that he paid in and by his Surety, but an

honour

honour to his Surety, and detraction from himſelf, when he ſaith he paid in and by his Surety. 3. *That Chriſt's Sufferings were full and proper Executions of the threatning of the Law to Man.* Here he denies Chriſt's Suffering under the Law that Man brake; and that his Puniſhment was no proper execution of the threatning of the Law, and therefore no proper Puniſhment. 4. *And ſo acquits them* ipſo facto *on the meer Suffering.* Here he makes up his charge by ambiguous Expreſſions —*without any further means of conveyance to give them right in it by Application.* 1. Here he inſinuates that there was no Diſcharge of Chriſt from the Sins of the Elect, which he ſuffered for: If ſo, no ſatisfaction. 2. He makes as if ſome held that Men have an Actual and Perſonal diſcharge, before their *being* by Grace or Nature; which is a falſe Charge, and a male Conſequent drawn by himſelf on the Doctrine: As if thoſe that held Chriſt's full and compleat Satisfaction by impetration, denied application. 3. He would have us believe it an Error that Chriſt purchaſed a right to Eternal Life for all the Elect, as the immediate effect of his purchaſe; and that our right comes by application, whereas our right lyes in the purchaſe only; and our claim of that right and poſſeſſion is by application.

The Socin. Error he thus repreſents, *That Jeſus Chriſt did not undergo any Penalty for our Sins, as meritorious, or promeritorious Cauſe, but only as occaſional:* And doth not Mr. *B.* ſay the ſame thing again and again in his Writings, only he foacheth in his promeritorious; which if the Socin. either did not uſe, or if they did, they would not deny it in the Senſe Mr. *B.* uſeth it, and as he hath explain'd himſelf.

ſelf. *And that he did not make any Satisfaction to God's Juſtice for us*, &c. there is nothing plainer in Mr. *B*'s Writings; both in his *Methodus* and *Univerſal Redemption*. He puts for Truth as follows.

That Jeſus Chriſt as a Publick Sponſor, did bear the Puniſhment deſerved by the Sins of the World, [he means of all and every Man] *and made to his Father a Satisfaction ſufficient for all.*

It is ſtrange a Biſhop of the Church of *England* ſhould look upon this as an Orthodox and Plain Confeſſion to diſtinguiſh a Man from a Socinian; for it's plain he prevaricates in ſpeaking of Chriſt as a Publick Perſon, for in the Antin. charge, he makes it a marvelous Error to ſay Chriſt ſatisfied Juſtice in the Perſon of all the Elect, ſo he muſt mean here, that Chriſt was ſuch a Publick Perſon, that was no Repreſentative or Surety, which is no publick Perſon at all. 2. In that he ſaith Chriſt did *bear the Puniſhment deſerved by Sin*, he alſo prevaricates, for he doth every-where deny that our Sins were imputed to Chriſt; that he ſuffered the Puniſhment of our Sins in any proper Senſe, and that Sin was but an occaſional, no proper Cauſe thereof, and therefore his Puniſhment was but Analogical, Equivalent to the Socinian's Metaphorical. He cann't mean in reſpect of proportion in a Mathematical Senſe, for that would overthrow his whole Hypotheſis.

Mr. *Lob* quotes enough to overthrow all that the Bp pleads on his behalf: He ſhews that in his *Methodus*, he expreſly declares *that the Sufferings of Chriſt were only a Natural Evil undergone by occaſion, and the remote cauſality of the Sins of Mankind, — and that Chriſt's ſufferings are only ſuf-*

ſufferings in an Improper and Analogical Senſe. Theſe things ſaith, the Bp, were long ſince written. The chief Expreſſion is, Chriſt's Sufferings had no proper meritorious Cauſe, but yet Man's Sins were the *Pro cauſa meritoria*, &c. and ſaith nothing to defend it, *p.* 151. He conſiders *whether Mr.* B's *own words do lay him open to the ſuſpicion of going too far towards the Socinians in this matter.* Now let us ſee whether Mr. *B.* hath a fair deliverance at the Bp's Bar.

Bp *In this caſe we muſt diſtinguiſh the Scripture Notion of Puniſhment from a Strict and Philoſophical Senſe of Puniſhment.* *R.* This is a ſtrange diſtinction of a Learned Bp; what means he by a Philoſophical Puniſhment? Is it morally Philoſophical, *i. e.* ſuch Puniſhment as belongs to the breach of a Moral Law? If ſo, ſure the Scripture Puniſhment cann't be diſtinguiſhed from it; for that is legal Puniſhment; but he ſaith it's ſtrict Puniſhment, *i. e.* according to the exact tenor of a Moral Law; if he mean ſo, it cannot be excluded from Scripture Puniſhment.

Bp *The Scripture ſpeaks in General of Chriſt's bearing our Sins*, &c. *but not a word of ſtrict and proper Puniſhment.*

R. No ſure, the Bp is miſtaken greatly, when he might ſee in the ſame Chapter that Chriſt was wounded for our Tranſgreſſions, was not that proper Puniſhment? Doth the Scripture ſay nothing of ſtrict and proper Puniſhment, when it ſaith the *Wages of Sin is Death*, Curſed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the Book of the Law? Is not the Curſe of the Law ſtrict and proper Puniſhment? If this be his Philoſophical Puniſhment, there's much of it in Scripture, and

it

it cann't be diſtinguiſh'd from it. Bp. *But of that which was appointed and accepted in order to atonement for our Sins, as the impulſive Cauſe, which become meritorious by his voluntary undertaking.* *R.* The Bp would ſuggeſt that there's ſome general improper acceptation of Puniſhment in Scripture always uſed, in which ſence Chriſt was Puniſhed; becauſe he ſaith the nature of the Expreſſions, that is, of the uſe of the word Puniſhment, doth imply as it were an impulſive cauſe; when indeed there was none but ſomething that God appointed and accepred in order to Atonement, but was not Puniſhment in ſtrict and proper Senſe. *But yet becomes meritorious by his voluntary undertaking.* *R.* That is as much as to ſay, there was nothing in Chriſt's Sufferings themſelves, that made them Meritorious, but ſomething Antecedent to them, *viz.* The Grace of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt in giving himſelf to be a ranſom, but the ranſom it ſelf and what he ſuffered had no merit in it. Here the Bp doth baſely *Baxterize* to caſt Mr. *Lob* in this Cauſe. To which I briefly return, that Puniſhment which was appointed by God, and accepted for full Satisfaction to his offended Juſtice, was ſtrict and proper Puniſhment, and of it ſelf meritorious, but Chriſt's Puniſhment was ſuch. The Major is true, elſe the Judge of all the World did not deal Righteouſly, in putting his Son to grief; for if he put him not to as much as the Law required, the Law was not ſatisfied; if he made only a ſhew of Puniſhing him, aud did not do it, then the Scripture hath given us but a kind of Romantick account of Chriſt's Puniſhment, when indeed there was no ſuch thing, nor any ſuch cauſe as the Scripture acquaints us with.

He acquaints us that Mr. *B.* not content with Scripture terms, falls to enquire into the Nature and Reaſon of the thing it ſelf, ſuggeſting that he would dive deeper into the thing than Scripture.

1. *That Puniſhment is a Natural Evil inflicted for a Moral.*

2. *That the Name of Puniſhment is ambiguous, becauſe it relates to Puniſhment juſtly inflicted, and that which is not; the former Proper, the latter Analogical.* So that this Analogical Puniſhment is that which hath a repreſentation, and looks like it; but is not ſo, *Similia non ſunt Idem*; things alike are not the ſame. And that which is improper is unjuſtly inflicted, *ergo*; and hence, Chriſt's Sufferings would be unjuſt. But he ſaith, the firſt and *moſt natural Senſe of puniſhment, is when the Offender ſuffers for his own fault; but there may be other reaſons of Puniſhment which he calls Analogical, and thoſe from nearneſs of Relation, as Subjects for Princes, or Vicarious*; and why I pray muſt theſe be called Analogical and Improper Puniſhments? Becauſe it's Mr. *B*'s pleaſure: Why would it not be better diſtributed, (unleſs to ſerve a turn). Puniſhment is either juſt or unjuſt: Juſt, is either that which falls on the Perſon committing the fault, or on another Relation, or Sponſor that ſuffers on his behalf, voluntarily ſubjecting to the Law in his Place; and what need we Analogical, when Proper payment is made to the Law? Bp *From whence he inferrs, that ſince Chriſt did not Die as a Sinner, therefore his Puniſhment could not be proper in the ſtricteſt ſenſe.* R. But if Chriſt Died for Sin, he Died as Sinners Die; though he did no Sin, and in that ſenſe was not a Sinner; yet he Died for our Sins, as the reaſon of judicial proceeding

ceeding againſt him; and this being done by a juſt God, for the honour of his Law, it could not be but proper Puniſhment: For all juſt Puniſhment is proper Puniſhment.

The Bp himſelf ſhews, that this will not hold Water; for whereas Mr. *B. diſtinguiſheth of Puniſhment by falſe imputation, and calls it unjuſt, but Analogical; and the Puniſhment of another by conſent he calls Analogical, but not unjuſt,* the Bp Anſwers, *If the Puniſhment be juſt, the Cauſe muſt be juſt; and Chriſt's could not be juſt with Relation to his own fault, for none is ſuppoſed; therefore there may be a juſt Puniſhment for another's fault; and if ſo, that* [viz. *the fault of another*] *may be truly ſaid to be the Meritorious cauſe of it, and the Puniſhment, a proper Puniſhment, although for another's fault.* What can be ſaid more directly and demonſtratively againſt Mr. *B.* in this Point? The Argument is this.

That Puuiſhment which is juſt, muſt have a juſt cauſe of fault, either in the Perſon ſuffering, or ſome other; and that cauſe is truly meritorious, and the Puniſhment a proper Puniſhment. But the Puniſhment of Chriſt was ſuch, therefore a proper Puniſhment.

Having thus thrown Mr. *B.* on his Back, he endeavours to make ſome little excuſes for him; *That which led Mr.* B. *in denying of it, was the Antinomians making Chriſt to undergo the proper Puniſhment of our Sin, becauſe our Perſonal Guilt was according to them transferred upon him.*

R. Hence it appears, that in the Bp's Judgment, Mr. *B.* was more excuſeable in being a Socinian, than in being an Antinomian; *for he finding,* (ſaith the Bp) *this Principle to be the Foundation of Antinom.*

tinom. that this could not be true, and therefore denied Chriſt's Puniſhment to be proper. But let me ſpeak what is truth, as to Mr. *B.* that I believe he had a further inſight into this Controverſie than it appears the Biſhop had; and would have told him, that theſe two Principles are inconſiſtent, and overthrow one another; *Chriſt's Suffering was proper Puniſhwent.* And *Chriſt bore no Perſonal guilt of any*; ſo that the Bp's Argumentthat refutes Mr. *B.* redounds back upon himſelf. So that inſtead of fetching off Mr. *B.* they both fall irrecoverably together by one blow; and it's eaſie to take notice how he buffets Mr. *B.* afterwards, quoting Mr. *B*'s words upon this reaſon; he ſaith, *But then as you (Mr.* Lob*) truly cite his words, he makes our Sins not to be the meritorious Cauſe of Chriſt's Sufferings, but a kind of promeritorious or occaſional Cauſe.* Therefore he means no more by promeritorious than occaſional; and in the Bp's Judgment falls under Mr. *L*'s Charge. Yea, he ſaith *we muſt do him right*, [is it to acquit or condemn Mr. *B*? Sure to paſs ſentence againſt him,] *So far as to take notice, that in ſtating the Socinian Controverſie, he makes it to conſiſt in denying that Chriſt did undergo any Penalty for our Sins, as the meritorious or promeritorious Cauſe, but only as occaſions; and yet here he makes the pro-meritorious cauſe and the occaſional the ſame; and he denies that our Sins were the meritorious cauſe; but only becauſe if we had not Sinned he had not ſuffered.* What is this any more, than an occaſional cauſe? If the World had not been created, Man had not fell; if there had been no Law, there had been no Sin; and what ſaith the Bp, truly he is neceſſitated to give Sentence againſt Mr. *B.* though in as ſoft terms as may be.

P. 15.

P. 156. *Theſe Expreſſions, I grant, taken alone, yield too much to the Socinians, who do not deny our Sins to have been a remote impulſive and occaſional cauſe of Chriſt's Sufferings, but deny them to be the meritorious cauſe of them.* What can be more plain and full to prove Mr.*B.* Socinianizing in theſe Points?

For all this, he will *not give up* Mr. *B.* to the Socinians; why? Becauſe he hath writ of the Doctrine of the Trinity; that he might do, and yet be a Socin. in the Doctrine of Satisfaction: But he hath written of the Doctrine of Satisfaction; yes, he hath retained the word to make his Doctrine go down the better, but hath endeavoured to deſtroy the thing to all intents and purpoſes.

Bp. *Theſe may be ſaid for his Vindication,* 1. *By laying all the paſſages together, he muſt mean ſomething more by his promeritous Cauſe, than meerly a remote occaſional Cauſe.*

A. This ſuppoſition is very unreaſonable when the Bp hath told us, from Mr *B*'s own Mouth, what he means by his promeritorious Cauſe. It is not hard to conceive what Mr. *B.* meant by promeritorious, it is only that Sin Antecedently to Chriſt's Death was meritorious of Death; but this merit terminated there, and never reached as a Cauſe meritorious of the Sufferings of Chriſt: *This merit the Bp ſaith is antecedent to the Legiſlator's act in accepting a Sponſor, and is but an occaſional Cauſe; and what ſaith he of an occaſional Cauſe? It's really no Cauſe at all,* &c. *juſt as if a Man ſaid, the* Fire *of* London *was the occaſional Cauſe of the Monument,* p. 169.

Bp.

Bp. *Now no Man can ſay the fault antecedently was any more than an occaſional cauſe of the innocent Perſon's Suffering.*

A. This is true in Mr *B*'s ſenſe, that the fault of the Offender makes him only guilty and deſerving of Puniſhment in general; but is not transferred to the Sponſor to be any Guilt or deſert of his Puniſhment; which is truly Mr. *B*'s meaning of his term promeritorious: And therein Mr. *B.* is conſonant to himſelf, in ſaying it's but an occaſional Cauſe, and that Sin is a remote impulſive Cauſe, *viz.* remote from Chriſt, tho' immediate and impulſive to Puniſhment. 2. This is true in the Bp's Senſe, who ſaith, Chriſt ſuffered Puniſhment for Sin, and bear the Perſonal Guilt of none, is to make the Sin of Man no more than an occaſional Cauſe: But the conſiſtency of the aſſertion lyes more on Mr. *B*'s ſide, becauſe he knew it to be a great inconſiſtency to ſay, that Chriſt bore proper Puniſhment, when he bore the guilt of no Sin.

Bp. *But taking all together, when he is admitted to ſuffer in the place of the Guilty, the Law with the Puniſhment makes the impulſive Cauſe become meritorious; and it is the immediate Reaſon of his Sufferings.*

R. This the Bp ſpeaks as the truth, and intimates as if he would have it Mr. *B*'s Senſe, but gives no proof that it is ſo; neither is it likely he ſhould, being not conſonant at all to what Mr. *B.* every-where maintains; and what if the Bp ſaith ſo, it's not conſonant at all to the Tenet he defends that Chriſt bore no Perſonal Guilt? For then how can the Guilt of any become the meritorious and immediate reaſon of his Sufferings?

Bp.

Bp. *The only queſtion then is, whether this can properly be called a meritorious cauſe.* A. *That may be taken in two Senſes.* 1. *In a ſtrict and proper ſence; ſo your ſelf deny that Chriſt merited by his own Sin.* 2. *In the ſenſe of the Law,* [*i. e.* Sin was legally charged on Chriſt] *and ſo that which was the near impulſive cauſe* [the fault of the Tranſgreſſor] *may be truly ſaid to be meritorious as to his ſufferings, becauſe they made it an act of Juſtice, which otherways had been an act of Power and Dominion.* *R.* See now the Bp's clear conceſſion. 1. That what is here ſpoken of Chriſt, it's in the ſenſe of the Law, not in a Phyſical or Moral ſenſe. 2. He makes the near impulſive cauſe Sin, and here Sin in its merits or deſerts, the immediate reaſon of Chriſt's ſuffering; can that be any thing but the Guilt of Men's Perſons? 3. Sin is ſuch a reaſon as may diſtinguiſh Chriſt's Puniſhment from an Act of Dominion, and make it an Act of Juſtice. How is it poſſible that any Man that ſaith this, can ſay that the guilt of Man's Sin was not charged on Chriſt as our Repreſentative in a legal Senſe, *i. e.* in a way of Judicial proceeding

Now doth the Bp lay down this as Mr. *B*'s ſenſe? No, he dare not; for if he did, Mr. *B.* (were he living) would ſay he had laid therein the Foundation of Antinomianiſm.

Bp. *The queſtion between us and the Socinians, is not about meritorious, and promeritorious Cauſe.* *R.* I wonder the Bp ſhould inſinuate ſo great a falſhood, when he knows the queſtion between us and the Socinians, is whether our Sins were the meritorious cauſe of Chriſt's ſufferings, or occaſional? And it's that which hath been at preſent under hand;

Pro-

Promeritorious being a word of Mr. *B*'s bringing in; it may be they might not think of it, to hide occaſional under it, as he doth, to make Men think he did not deny all merit in this Caſe.

Bp. *But the queſtion is, whether Chriſt did really undergo the Puniſhment of our Sins in order to be a Sacrifice of Atonement for them? And in this we have Mr.* B*'s conſent expreſs'd on all occaſions.* *R.* I wonder the Bp can ſpeak thus, why doth he not acquaint us then with his conſent in one paſſage; if he hath any ſuch paſſage, doth he mean as he ſpeaks? No, no more than the Bp, who could not, as long as he held that Chriſt bore the perſonal guilt or deſert of none.

It is now evident the Bp hath ſaid nothing to the purpoſe for vindication of Mr. *B.* what hath been ſaid hath been for a greater confirmation of the Charge, and wounding his own Cauſe.

He ſaith little further, but to excuſe, 1. Liberty muſt be given to Metaphyſick Heads. 2. Tells a Story of *Lubbertus* and *Mcacovius*. 3. He tells us of favourable interpretations, that are to be given to Perſons, that keep to the main point, as if this were but a trifling matter between the Socin. and us.

4. Mr. *L.* argues that Mr. *B.* ſpeaks after the Unitarians. — *That Chriſt did not undergo puniſhment properly ſo called, but in a popular ſenſe of Puniſhment.* The Bp in anſwer doth fill up *p.* 162, 163, 164, 165, 166. in ſhewing what ſlippery Gentlemen, the Writers of the Unitarian Doctrine are, but nothing to Mr. *L*'s Charge of Mr. *B.* therefore yields the truth thereof, and agrees with Mr. *L.* in theſe words. Bp. you ſay, *Rectoral Juſtice doth eſſentially reſpect the Law in its diſtributions,* — *what-*

——*Whatever a Soveraign may do in acts of Dominion.* — *A Rector cannot juſtly inflict Sufferings on an innocent perſon as ſuch. Here I grant you have come up to the true ſtate of the Caſe between the Socin. and us*; and therefore we ſhall leave it, and let the Reader judge who is caſt at the Bp's Bar.

But before I end, it's neceſſary to conſider how the Bp. doth reconcile his two Principles.

1. That the Sin of Man was the immediate, impulſive and meritorious Cauſe of Chriſt's Sufferigns: This he holds againſt the Socinians and Mr. *B.*

2. That Chriſt bore not the Perſonal Guilt of any Legally, but that all Perſonal Guilt remains on the Sinner, and was not legally transferred to Chriſt. For this he ſaith, *P.* 167.

Bp. 1. *We ſay, that Puniſhment may be juſtly inflicted, where there was a Tranſlation of Guilt by Relaxation of the Law, as to perſonal Offenders, and admitting a Mediator to ſuffer in their ſtead.*

R. No Guilt is tranſlated by Relaxation of a Law, for that diſpenceth only. 2. If the Law be relaxed as to Perſonal Offenders, the doing of thoſe things after the relaxation, is not Sin, which was ſo before; what needs a transferring to another? 3. If the Precept be not relaxt (which they will be loath to ſay it is) then the Penalty muſt; and if ſo, either to a part only, or to the whole: If to the whole, what need is there of a Tranſlation? If to a part only, then part of the Sin only is transferred, and Chriſt Died only for ſome part of our Sin, not all. Hence one part of our Salvation is owing to the relaxed Law, and the other to Chriſt. Hence Chriſt did not ſatisfie the Law, in the

proper and ſtrict Nature of it, and Chriſt's Sufferings were improper Puniſhments, according to Mr. *B.* And here the Bp runs on ground.

Bp. He ſaith, 2. *Abſolute Promiſes of the New-Covenant, on which ſo much weight is laid, (without comparing them with other places) ſpeak no more of Chriſt's Sufferings, than they do of any Conditions in us.* Here our own Qualifications and Performances, are made to have an equality of conditionality, fœderally with Chriſt's Sufferings; and if Chriſt's Sufferings be meritorious, ſo are they too.

Bp. 3. *The notion of Satisfaction lays the Foundation of Antinomianiſm, which attributes unto God ſuch a ſort of vindictive Juſtice which requires an abſolute and perfect Satisfaction in the ſame kind for the Sins of Mankind.* R. How much this kind of ſatisfaction borders upon Socinianiſm in the true meaning of it, it's eaſie to judge; and what little reaſon the Bp had to reject the Principles that Mr. *B.* built upon is manifeſt, being a firmer Foundation for his building; And after all that he hath ſaid againſt them, as too much favouring Socinianiſm, he is fain to lay hold on them to ſupport his own Fabrick. See here the pitiful ſhifts Men are put to that wander from the way of truth.

Argu-

Arguments to prove that Chriſt bore the Perſonal Guilt of all them for whom he Suffered.

THAT the leſs intelligent Reeader may not be at loſs for the truth, not ſo eaſily finding it among the Controverſal Difficulties of a Diſpute, I have thought good to make plain proof of this great Queſtion in the affirmative.

And that we may prevent enlargements, I premiſe,

1. That by Perſonal Guilt, is meant the Guilt of every particular Perſon for whom Chriſt Died; as of *Noah*, *David*, and *Peter*, *&c.*

2. I take Guilt and Sin, and the merit and deſert of Sin, to be equivalent terms in the ſenſe of the Spirit of God; and though the Scripture uſe the word Sin, and we moſt commonly ſay Guilt, this is exegetical, to ſhew that we mean not that the Subjective Phyſical Act of Sin was transferred to Chriſt; nor the inherent Moral Pollution: But whatever is in either, that is a Tranſgreſſion of the Law, the Law-relation of all Sin, ſo far as the Law condemns the Sinner for it, was charged on Chriſt, *i. e.* Legally and Juridically in the Juſt God's diſtribution of Juſtice. Then I argue,

Arg. 1. He that was puniſht for Sin, bore Sin in the Perſonal Guil, *i. e.* the Legal Charge of it, as the reaſon of his Puniſhment; but Chriſt was puniſht for it by the Conceſſion of our oppoſites, *Ergo*, The Major is true. 1. Becauſe God is Juſt. 2. Puniſhment without a Reaſon is very unjuſt. 3. There

was no reaſon in Chriſt abſolutely conſidered for his Puniſhment, therefore in ſome others; therefore the Perſonal Sin of ſome or other. 4. Without a bearing of Sin in the legal deſert of ſome or other, he could not be juſtly puniſhed by the Law.

Arg. 2. He that was made Sin for us, was made ſo by charging our Sins upon him, bare Perſonal Guilt; for he was made that, which he was not in himſelf: Now how could he be made ſo, but by an imputation of the Sins of others to him, a legal proceeding with him in judicature; which could be no other than by Judging and Puniſhing him for ſome Guilt that merits the Wages of Death? The Anſwer the Socinians and others make to 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. is that he was made Sin as the Sacrifices were, becauſe a Sin-offering is called ἁμαρτία: But I anſwer, 1. It was eſſential to the Sin-offering to have the the Perſonal Guilt of the Sinner charged npon it. 2. When ἁμαρτία is uſed for a Sin-offering, it's περὶ ἁμαρτίας. 3. The Prophet *Iſa.* doth only uſe חטאת but ערן when he ſpeaks of Chriſt's bearing Sin, which laſt word is never uſed for Sin-offering. 4. He was made Sin as we are made Righteous; now we are not made Righteous by being made Sacrifices for Sin, but by imputation.

Arg. 3. He that bore the Curſe of the Law to Redeem us from it, bore alſo the Perſonal Guilt of our Sins; but Chriſt bore the Curſe of the Law, *Gal.* 3. 13. For the Major it's as clear as the Sun, becauſe Curſe is inſeparable from Sin; the Law curſeth no where but where it finds Perſonal Guilt. Let theſe Men tell me where a Curſe falls upon the head of any one, but of ſuch wherein there is Sin in ſome legal ſenſe or other.

Arg. 4.

Arg. 4. If the Prieſts and Sacrifices of old, the Types of Chriſt and his Sufferings, had the Perſonal Guilt of Sin laid upon them, then Chriſt the Antitype, in his Sufferings, had Perſonal Guilt laid upon him: But the Antecedent is without contradiction, yea, and the Conſequence; becauſe the Antitype is to anſwer the Type, in all things wherein it is a Type.

Arg. 5. If they that were Puniſhed by the Law, did bear their Perſonal Sins by the Law; then if Chriſt, was Puniſhed by the Law, he alſo bore Sin by the Law. But the Antecedent is true by the Scripture, both in them that are recorded to have been Puniſhed in Perſon for their own Sins, *Lev.* 20. 20. and 22. 9. and 24. 15. *Numb.* 9. 13. and 14. 34. and 18, 22, 32. *Ezek.* 23. 49. and in ſuch as are recorded to have been Puniſhed or Suffer for others, *Iſa.* 53. 11. *Ezek.* 4. 4, 5, 6. The Conſequence muſt be true if Chriſt was Puniſhed by Law, and was one that Suffered for others; the proof whereof the Scripture is full of.

Arg. 6. If Chriſt bore not Perſonal Guilt, but every one's Perſonal Guilt ſtill remains, then the Spirit of God taught *David* to pray after his Sin in vain, *Deliver me from Blood guiltineſs, O God.* But *David*'s Prayer was not in vain, but was he delivered from his Perſonal Guilt of Blood? Or elſe he muſt at this day be a Blood-guilty Murderer in Heaven.

Arg. 7. A Surety to God for Sinners, bears their Sins in being Puniſhed for them; but Chriſt was a Surety, *Heb.* 7. 22. There's no fence againſt ſuch a Flail as this one expreſs place. 2. The Minor is quarrelled by our Adverſaries, but not Univerſally denied, yet they would make a ſeeming Evaſion, that they

they will have Chriſt a Surety for God to us, and not for us to God; and that Chriſt was no Money-Surety for us, we being Criminals; and that Sin muſt not be lookt on as a Debt; the folly of all which hath been made ſufficiently manifeſt.

Arg. 8. If the Perſonal guilt of Sin was taken away by Jeſus Chriſt, then Chriſt muſt bear Perſonal Guilt: But the Guilt of Perſonal Sins was taken away by Chriſt, as appears by 1 *John* 3. 5. *Heb.* 9. 26. *He took away Sin by the Sacrifice of himſelf:* Sin cannot be ſaid to be taken away, if it be not taken away in the Perſonal Guilt. The Major appears from the Type of the Scape-Goat, *Levit.* 16.

Arg. 9. Where there's *no Condemnation*, there Perſonal Guilt is taken away, *nor nothing to be laid to the Charge of a Perſon*; but there's no Condemnation, (*i. e.* Reaſon of Condemnation in the Eye of the Law) in a Believer, *Rom.* 8. for there's no Reaſon of Condemnation, but Guilt of Sin; and none takes off the reaſon of our Charge of Fault to Law Condemnation, but Chriſt by bearing Sin unto Puniſhment and Satisfaction, *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. For where there is the Perſonal Guilt of Sin, there's Condemnation. Now this Freedom from Condemnation was fully obtain'd and procured by Chriſt's Sacrifice, but the *purchaſed Right* is not received and poſſeſſed till Application; till then a Sinner is ſhut up and impriſoned under the Law, as to State and Conſcience; but when he is in Chriſt Jeſus by Faith, he is fully inſtated in the purchaſed Poſſeſſion.

Arg. 10. If Chriſt's Puniſhment was without his bearing of our Perſonal Guilt, there was no change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, according to 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. for as we were, ſo we remain to be guilty Sinners; and ſo long as we are ſo, we cannot be righ-

righteous; we can't be made the Righteouſneſs of God in Chriſt, ſo long as we remain guilty Sinners in our ſelves.

Arg. 11. Where Perſonal Guilt remains, there's no Acceptation with God; for all our Acceptation, either of Perſons or Services, is in Chriſt, God profeſſing he will not clear the Guilty.

Arg. 12. I might argue from all thoſe places of Scripture that ſpeak out this Truth fully and expreſly, which cannot have any rational Senſe put upon them, no leſs than three times in *Iſa.* 53. and 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. who his own ſelf bare our Sins in his Body on the Tree.

There's no one Truth in the Scripture, that is more fully and plainly recorded in the Old Teſtament and New. The Spirit telling us of a Believer's *Sin covered, not imputed, Pſal.* 32. *Rom.* 4. Of our *being made nigh to God, and Chriſt being our Peace, Eph.* 2. 13, 14, 15. Likewiſe Chriſt *died the juſt for the unjuſt, to bring us unto God,* 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. But this is enough to confirm the weak, and to convince Gainſayers, and to lead all the Lovers of Truth into the Mind of the Spirit in this great Article of our Faith.

The Presbyterian Articles againſt the Diſſenting Brethren Anſwered.

I Had thought when I began this Task to have paſſed over the firſt part altogether; for tho' I found it a very falſe Hiſtory, yet I knowing from whoſe Hands the Bp. had it, I did not think he was chargeable ſo much with the falſhood, as with an unjuſt unwarineſs and partiality, to take up the Report of a Difference, and to publiſh the Hiſtory of it to the World from one Party

Party only concerned therein, I deem'd therefore enough to refer the Reader to the true History of the *Union and Breach*; but upon the review of the said false Historical Account; and finding a fresh Presentment brought in against the Dissenting Brethren from the late Union, by the *grand Rebuker* under divers Articles, for holding and publishing many poysonsome dangerous Heresies, of so mischievous a Nature, that he teacheth his tractable Reader a form of Prayer, to use still before he reads them; to wit, that he may *not suck in the Bane and Poyson thereof.*

And finding the Bp. received the said Presentment very much like a Gentleman, and sends forth his very Christian Summons for our Appearance to the high Charges in these Words: *The Accusation being now publick, and the Nation is concern'd as to the Dishonour done to Religion thereby*, altho' I had seen the said Reproaches in the Presbyterians Hands, and found they had brought the said Brethren under their Censure in their unrighteous way of proceeding, without any hearing, I thought more expedient to slight than answer their unreasonable Clamours, being abundantly conscious of my own Innocency in those Matters; my great Mistake was in mistaking them, being at my Concurrence with them in the Union, (for which I have deeply repented) but a meer Stranger to their Persons Ways and Actions. And before I come to the particular Articles, it's necessary to premise a few things; that now,

1. I think it necessary for my self to appear to the Accusations, and make publick Answer to them, but do not undertake that all I say is the Sense of my Brethren in every Particular; I suppose they may concur with me so far, that some different Apprehensions will make no Breach in our mutual Love and Affections.

2. I

2. I apprehend it very unreasonable, as well as unchristian and ungenteel, to charge these things for dangerous Errors upon a whole Party, which are pretended to be taken from the Writings or Sayings of one or two only.

3. It is very traducing and slanderous; 1. Not to prove the Words charged for Error in the Sense they represent them, on the Party that wrote or spake them, but to make an Accusation at large, and at random. 2. That they publish these for Errors before they had disputed them with such as they charge, and proved them so.

4. Let me ask our angry Brethren a few Questions for my Information. 1. Whether they think in their Consciences, and in the sight of God, they have dealt uprightly and sincerely with the Truth, and with their Brethren in this Controverlie? 2. Whether it becomes the Saints to appear such publick bitter Accusers of their Brethren, as appears by the foul-mouth'd Rebuker, and others, whoso have been employ'd and applauded in this dirty Service? 3. Whether it be for the Honour of the Nonconformists thus to bewray their own Nests? 4. Whether they think not in their Consciences that many things they charge for Errors are great Truths in some Sence or other? Therefore is it not very unfair to charge in general and dubious terms, without any Distinctions or Explications? Doth this become learned Divines?

The Rebukers Articles which he brought into Court were, I find to the number of 21, but it seems the judicious Bp. contracted them to Six, which he hath called us to appear to, looking upon the rest (I suppose) as frivolous, illiterate or spiteful; the Six, with my respective Answers, are as follows.

Er. 1. *That Pardon is rather the Condition of Faith, having a cauſal Influence thereunto, then Faith and Repentance are of Pardon.*

A. The Words were mine in *tranſitu* of a Diſcourſe, and therefore it is very unfair to expoſe them, without ſhewing their Dependance. 1. I have ſhewn, and proved, and will ſtand by it, that *Pardon*, *Faith and Repentance*, belong not to the conditional Part of the new Covenant, but to the Promiſory. 2. That Pardon, Faith and Repentance, altho' they are not Fœderal Conditions, yet being connected in the Promiſe, may have a Connexion conditional given to them, as if a Man believe he receiveth Pardon, in believing; if he repent, he will believe; if he repent, and believe, he ſhall be ſaved; and I renounce not the Scripture Language in anything, but deſire to underſtand and explain it in its true and genuine Senſe. 3. I ſay, that if we talk of the Fœderal Conditionality of Faith to Pardon; Pardon is rather a Fœderal Condition of Faith and Repentance, than Faith of Pardon; I ſay, not that it is, but rather becauſe diſtinguiſhing Pardon aright into Active and Paſſive; I ſay, Pardon Paſſive received can't be without Faith to receive it, but Pardon Active muſt be before Faith. 1. Becauſe the Object that the Hand receives muſt be before the Inſtrument that receives it. 2. The Grace of Pardon is in God to be beſtowed before we receive it. 3. There is Pardon in Chriſt for all that ſhall believe, *Jo.* 17. 20. See what Mr. *Capel* ſaith on this point, *It is one thing for all the Sins of all the Elect to be pardoned to Chriſt for them; that was done before we were, or our Sins were, another thing to be pardoned to them; Chriſt was made a Curſe for us by Imputation, for that the Father did impute all our Sins, as a Judge to Chriſt, as our Surety,* [the true notion

notion of Imputation, that it is not an Act of Grace, but a Judicial Act] *and God did exact all of him as guilty by that Law*, &c. 3. Pardon in God and in Christ hath a causal Influence on Faith and Repentance: 1. Pardon is an essential cause of a pardoned Person, the Abstract being the formal cause of the Concrete; pardoning Grace doth effectually work all Graces of the Spirit in us, the pardoning Grace of the Father, Son, and Spirit. 2. The Gospel preached to Sinners, which is Pardon of Sin; the Gospel preached to *Abraham*, is that which works Faith thro' the effectual Operation of the Spirit, *Act.* 13. 39. *Rom.* 10. 15. And it was preached to *David* by *Nathan*, 2 *Sam.* 12. 17. as done before his particular Repentance, express'd *Psal.* 51. therefore if we talk of Fœderal Conditions, Pardon is rather such, than Faith and Repentance, because it's in Nature as well as Time antecedent; and such an antecedent, as hath a causal Influence. And hence I also assert, that every necessary antecedent, tho' with causal Influence upon the consequent, is not a Fœderal Condition.

Er. 2. *That Sin it self, as opposed to Guilt, was laid on Christ, and Christ was reputed a Criminal, not only by Man, but God.*

A. As to the first clause, they should have pointed out the Person that said it. If I spake it, or writ it, I was asleep then; for when we say Sin was laid on Christ, we speak not of it by way of Opposition unto Guilt, but by way of Identity or Sameness with Guilt, in the Dialect of the Spirit of God, our use of the Word Guilt, being but an apt Exegetical Term to express the meaning of Sin in this Point, because the Physical *Subjtratum* of Sin can't be transferred to another, but the Law Relation may.

As to the second charge, 1. It will be easily granted by the Accusers, that a Sinner's Debts to the Law are Crimes. 2. To say he was a reputed Criminal in Law only, is by a received Sense to justifie the personal and absolute Innocency of Christ in himself. 3. I suppose they will not deny, that if Sin was charged on Christ for the delivery of Sinners, it was done by God as his Act, and not by the false Accusation of Satan or his Instruments; for the Salvation of Sinners by his bearing Sin, was never their Design; and it's said God laid upon him the Iniquity of us all, *Isa.* 53. 4. The term Criminal might possibly be used by some or other, with a good Meaning, but I look not upon it as *proper*, and I don't know that I have used it; if I have, I have better considered of it. 1. Because tho' the Scripture saith Sin was laid on Christ, and that he was made Sin, yet it saith not that he was a Sinner, or a Criminal. 2. Because his bearing Sin, and being made so, it plainly implies that he was not so in himself, but made so by Law Imputation, and by standing in a Surety relation to the Law for us. 3. A Sinner or Criminal doth in an ordinary and common Acceptation import a Committer, or Perpetrator of Sin, which Christ never was not reputed by God so to be. Therefore herein God shews his wonderful Wisdom, in teaching us to speak of Christ in this great Mystery with so much Exactness.

Er. 3. *That the Doctrine of Justification before Faith is not an Error, but a great and glorious Truth, and therefore we believe that we may be justified declaratively.*

A. It is an Error, and it is not an Error; it is an Error to say Justification by Faith is before Faith in time, and a contradiction in *Adjecto*, therefore I never

ver ſaid ſo for Juſtification by Faith can't be before Faith is in the Receiver to receive it by: But that Juſtification is before Faith, is a glorious Truth; and this I muſt affirm for Truth, that there is Juſtification before Faith, if we diſtinguiſh of Juſtification aright, as of Pardon, and ſay it's actively and paſſively to be underſtood; active Juſtification is in God that juſtifieth, *Rom.* 8. the Grace of Juſtification a Gift to us. 2. Chriſt as the Head and Repreſentative of the Elect, was juſtified, and all the Elect fundamentally in him, elſe Jeſus Chriſt's ſuffering as a publick Perſon, could not have been, he was taken *from Priſon and Judgment.* 3. Juſtification in Application, is by Nature before Faith, becauſe all Grace apprehends the Sinner before he apprehends it, and is the immediate cauſe of a Sinner's apprehending it. Again, the Grace of Juſtification is in nature before Sanctification, and the Foundation of it by the conſent of Proteſtants; and therefore it's ſaid in that Sence, that God juſtifies the ungodly; not that we ſhould be ungodly, but that he finds and takes us in that State; and ſo doth the ſanctifying Grace of God in Regeneration, God doth both juſtifie and ſanctifie the ungodly, by his active apprehending Grace, *Phil.* 3. 12. As to the ſecond clauſe I ſuppoſe none can deny, that therefore we believe that we may be juſtified, *Rom.* 10. 10. and elſewhere; and as to the laſt Word, wherein they lay the ſtreſs of the Error, they might put it in unexceptionable Terms by adding a monoſyllable, *they believe that they may be juſtified, and declaratively,* they believe that they may receive, and have Eternal Life, and that they may know they have it, according to the expreſs Words of the Apoſtle, 1 *John* 5. 12, 13.

Er. 4. *Union to Chriſt is before Faith at leaſt by Nature; and we partake of the Spirit by virtue of that Union, and there's a compleat Union with Chriſt before the Act of Faith.*

A. For the firſt clauſe of the charge I own it, and have defended it as Truth, and ſhall ſtand by it, and am ready to diſpute it with the Accuſers when they pleaſe; in the mean time, let them tell me whether Faith be not a vital Act of the Soul? If ſo, how came the Fruit to grow on the Branch before it was in the Root, Chriſt Jeſus? Again, if Faith be the Effect of Union to Chriſt, then Union is the cauſe, and in Nature antecedent to it. There's no need to enlarge upon ſo plain a Truth, the ſecond clauſe is as true, that by virtue of this Union, or in this Union we firſt partake of the Spirit, becauſe the Spirit is *the Spirit of Chriſt, Rom.* 8. The Spirit is the Bond of this Union; for, 3. I know not whether it be mine in the terms expreſſed, but if it were, there was ſomething ſaid to explain it; the Senſe I am ready to defend it in is this, that whatever Union Chriſt makes is compleat in it ſelf, ſuch is vital Union in Regeneration, where the Regenerated is altogether paſſive; and all Regeneration is perfect, tho' the regenerated is not; every one conceived is perfectly conceived, tho' the conceived is not perfectly grown; every one born is perfectly born, tho' every one born is not perfect; ſo is every one born of the Spirit, he hath compleat Life, tho' he is not compleat in the Acts of Life; compleatneſs of Life, and compleatneſs in exerciſing the Acts of Life, areto be diſtinguiſhed.

Er. 5. *It is a great Truth, that God ſees no Sin in a Believer, and Sin can do no Hurt to a Believer; God is not diſpleaſed with his People, and is not angry*

angry with the Perſons of Believers for their Sins.

A. Here are the 12, 13, 14 of the Rebuker's Articles crowded together. As to the firſt, I ſay, 1. They are the Words of Scripture, let the Exceptors ſhew and prove that the Spirit of God means quite contrary to what it ſaith in that Place; *Num.* 21. 21. and that all other Places of Scripture that confirm this Truth are falſe, and mean quite contrary; as when it ſaith a Believer is bleſſed his Sins, being covered, and not imputed, *Pſal.* 32. 1, 2. This is Poyſon; but the meaning is, He is bleſſed whoſe Sin is uncovered before God, and his Iniquity imputed; when God ſaith he doth not remember our Iniquities, you muſt read it, He doth remember our Iniquity. Let them give a rational Senſe, of *Jer.* 50. 20. *Mic.* 7. 19. *Jer.* 31. 34. *Heb.* 8. 12. *ch.* 10. 17.

But let them not take us to be ſo ſtupid, as to underſtand this of the Eye *of his Omniſciency*, but in reſpect of the Eye *of his Juſtice*, *Pſal.* 51. 9. when they give us any probable Interpretation of the forementioned Places of Scripture, ſo to prove the Word of God falſe, *Num.* 23. In the Senſe we take it, as I could never ſee yet the greateſt of them ever did, we will acknowledge it an Error, in the mean time let them give us leave to believe it, and receive it as an Article of Faith.

The ſecond Clauſe the Rebukers 13 is, *That Sin can't do any real Hurt to a Believer.*

A. Why is this charged upon the diſſenting Brethren? Did they ever hear any one of them aſſert it *in Terminis*; he that uttered it in the Ardency of a popular Diſcourſe was above 50 Years ſince, and is it Blaſphemy or Hereſie to defend a good Man's Diſcourſe by a charitable Interpretation? If they had a Grain of Charity, they may eaſily ſee that he meant not

not according to that groſs Senſe they would put upon the ſaying, that he intended not to countenance Profeſſors living in Sin, nor in reſpect of Grief, Sorrow and Darkneſs, occaſioned by a Believer's Fall into Sin, but his meaning was, 1. That their Falls into Sin ſhould not prejudice that State of Union to Chriſt, according to *Rom.* 8.35,36,37,38. 2. That tho' Sin remain in them, yet they ſhall not have Dominion over them, according to *Rom.* 6. 14, 15. 3. That tho' they fall, they ſhall ariſe, according to *Mic.* 7. 8. 4. That God will over-rule all the Falls of his Children for their Spiritual Good and Advantage, according to *Rom.* 8. 28. and therefore he ſaith *real hurt.*

The third thing here, which is the Rebuker's 14th, *God is not diſpleaſed with his People*, i. e. *their Perſons.* *A.* Why do they not explain what they mean by God's diſpleaſure; do they mean *Paternal or Vindictive:* If they mean Paternal, in a way of Rebuke and Chaſtiſment, who denies it? If they mean Vindictive, we deny it. Again, why do they not tell us what they mean by God's People, do they mean a Collection of Profeſſing People, Church or Nation? Such may be the general Defection of theſe from their Profeſſion, never real and true, that God's Vindictive Wrath may go forth againſt them, as often againſt his People of Old. Laſtly, God is never pleaſed with the Sins of his People, therefore condemned all their Sins in the Fleſh of Chriſt, *Rom.* 8.3. But God is not diſpleaſed with the Perſons of his People, ſuch as are called according to purpoſe, becauſe he loved them with an Eternal Love; and he is a God that changeth not.

Art. 6.

Art. 6. *Believers are as Righteous as Christ.* A. Moſt know who is Charged here, it is one that is gone to give up his Account to his Lord and Maſter: I doubt not but it is with Joy, and that he hath received a Crown of Glory that fadeth not: Tho' the Rebuker hath trampled upon his Bones and Memory, in his Pride and Inſolency; and not only upon his, but on thoſe of that other Eminent Servant of God that is at reſt with him: And why? Becauſe both of them in their Life-time ſerved their Generation, in bearing faithful Teſtimony to the Truths of Jeſus.

I need ſay nothing to this Article: That worthy Servant of Chriſt ſpake enough to explain himſelf in that Poſition, in his Printed Sermons which he Preached at *Pinner's*-Hall: The ſum of it was, that he meant not in reſpect of Sanctification, for there our beſt Holineſs is imperfect, therefore he *means not in a way of Similitude* to his Perſonal Holineſs and Righteouſneſs; *but in a way of equality*, *i. e.* in reſpect of a Believer's relation to the Law, as Chriſt hath made full Satisfaction to the Law for a Believer, ſo he is as fully diſcharged from the Law, and condemnation thereof, as Chriſt is, *i. e.* the Law hath no more to do to condemn a Believer, than to condemn Chriſt: His full Original Diſcharge having been in Chriſt, the thing is made plain by an illuſtration. A Rich Alderman pays a Poor Man's Debt of 10*l.* and ſets him at liberty from the Proſecution of the Law, and Impriſonment; which done, the Poor Man can be no more Proſecuted by the Law, than the Rich Alderman, being as Righteous in the Eye of the Law as the Alderman: But he cann't ſay, he is as Rich, as Wiſe, as Valuable in Eſtate or Perſon; or ſo

Able to pay the Debts of others as the Alderman.

I know Mr. *M.* was not the firſt that inſiſted on this Notion, I have read it in Mr. *Shephard* of *N. E.* as I take it, in his *Sound Believer*; and I am ſure the Rebuker cann't call him an Antinom. As for my own part, I chuſe not to uſe the Expreſſion, (tho' it's in Mr. *M*'s. *Accept.* a Truth) becauſe many that are ſhort in Underſtanding, are apt to abuſe it; and others to make an advantage thereof to wreak their malice againſt the great Truths of the Goſpel, as theſe Accuſers have done. But eſpecially, becauſe I apprehend the truth therein contained may be delivered in leſs offenſive words.

The Bp hath pitched upon Ten of the Rebuker's Articles, and reduced them to Six; there is about Eleven more which he thought had no weight or ſence in them. As,

Ac. 1. *To talk of a Goſpel threat, is at beſt a Catechreſis; and nothing elſe can ſave it from being a Bull*; I ſuppoſe the Bp thought that no Scholar could make an Error of it. I am the Man that wrote it, and I will ſtand by it as a very favourable Reflection upon ſuch as talk ſo improperly and impertinently.

Ac. *As to the Elect, there was never any guilt upon them, in reſpect of the Righteous Judgment of God*, in foro Dei: *But that which accompanied the Letter of the Law, ſetting in with Conſcience.*

This Article it ſeems the Bp could make nothing of, nor I; indeed it being one that *M. W.* hath patcht up. For I deny not the Elect are under the Law, and Children of Wrath according to it, till effectual calling; but that God's Vindictive Righteous Judgment is ever executed upon them, I do deny.

Ac. 9.

Ac. 9. *It is denied that God requires Faith as an indiſpenſible Qualification in them, whom he will juſtifie for Chriſt's Merits.* *A.* This ſmells of Mr. *W.*'s qualifying Righteouſneſs; all is Goſpel with the Rebuker, which he hears from his Oracle. Now to give a brief Anſwer here, becauſe I have diſputed this Article with the Gentleman already. I do not deny that God requires Faith, and will work Faith in all thoſe that God will juſtifie by Faith, but I deny that God requires Faith indiſpenſibly in all that he will juſtifie by Chriſt's Merits; for he juſtifies ſaved Infants by Chriſt's Merits, but who can ſay Faith is required of them? *Laſtly*, He doth not require Faith in any as a ſubordinate qualifying Righteouſneſs, to Juſtification by Chriſt's, for ſuch it is the Gentleman would have, which I have formerly refuted, but all Men muſt be Hereticks with the Presbyterians, that ſay not after him.

Ac. 10. *All that a Believer can pray for is, the further Manifeſtation of Pardon, for he knows that all his Sins are pardoned.* *A.* This is *Ejuſdem farinæ & Originis:* 1. I ſuppoſe a Believer may know that all his Sins are pardon'd, or elſe the Scripture ſpeaks much in vain. 2. Is it a poyſonſome Error to pray for a further Manifeſtation of pardoning Grace, and Confirmation in, and Continuance of that Knowledge? 3. If a Man do not know his Sins are pardoned, or doth doubt of it, ſure he will pray that he may be Partaker of pardoning Grace, and be confirmed in the Knowledge of it; I know none of the accuſed but do pray thus, and that daily, *Forgive us our Treſpaſſes*, as we pray for daily Bread when we have it in the Houſe; for whatever we have of Spiritual or outward good things, it is God muſt give unto us richly to enjoy it.

Ac. 15. *Legal Convictions before Faith are no more than Sin, it's but a filthy Conscience*, &c. *A.* I believe all that Author and his second can do can't make any better of it. So saith the Spirit of God, *Tit.* 1. 15. and the Bp. knew that the Articles of the Church of *England* said so, and therefore he inserts it not as an Error.

Ac. 16. *All imperfect Holiness is Sin.* *A.* Who said so?

This is another dab of *W.*'s Spittle, which the Rebuker hath likct up.

Ac. 17. *Turn ye, turn ye, why will you die? Is but the Triumph of the Law over a dead Sinner.* *A.* I argued the meaning of that Place with *D. W.*'s, and shew'd that it could be for no other end than to convince the *Jews* of their Inability in themselves, (that trusted to their own Strength and Righteousness inherent) to work out their justifying Righteousness and Salvation, and to bring them to the Grace of God in the Promise; the Truth of which I am ready to discuss with any of them.

Ac. 18. *I can't make Head or Tail of; he should have told us where he had it, or how he came to dream of it?*

Ac. 20. *Christ's Incarnation was no part of his Humiliation.* *A.* The terms are falsly charged, there's no Man that saith that Christ's Abode in the Flesh was not his Humiliation, and what he suffered in it; but if he means the Divine Nature's Assumption it self of Flesh this was an Act of Divine Power; I say, the taking of our Nature; for he could not be humbled in the Divine Nature, therefore he took Man's, that he might be humbled in it after his Assumption. This was a wiser and more learned Man's Opinion than they that oppose it. If the Rebuker had read Dr. *Ames*'s *Medulla*, one would think he should have been

been ashamed to put it down as a baneful and poysonsome Error, altho' Mr. *W.*'s did, who it may be never heard of it till Mr. *M.* preached it. The Bp. here cast it out, and as not consonant to the Rebuker's Form of Prayer.

Ac. 21. *We coaless upon believing into one Mystical Person with Christ, which is distinguish'd from Legal Union, which is before Faith.* *A.* Sure the Rebuker and his learned Master shew'd themselves mighty acute Divines here at last; for they seem to take the mystical Body of Christ for a great Error; for that the Error lyes, in asserting that Believers are Members of the mystical Body of Christ, if they mistake not Person for Body. 2. If they accuse any for saying Believers make one mystical Person with Christ, they should have detected that ignorant Person, and not charged it on their dissenting Brethren; surely they are not such pitiful Wretches, as not to distinguish between the mystical Body of Christ and his Person, and to talk of a mystical Person. 3. This mystical Person must be distinguished from a legal Union before Faith. Where is this Stuff put together? I challenge these Men to tell the Man, and quote the Place where such a Mess of Nonsense is put together; if they do not, it must pass for one of the horrid Defamations, wherewith they have bespattered their dissenting Brethren, to render them odious unto the World. I suppose the Bp could make nothing of it.

The Lord give them Repentance and Remission of these great Sins of the first Magnitude, and that they persist not thus to fly in the Face of Christ and his faithful Members, and that he leave them not to a reprobate Mind, as well as such a persecuting false Tongue, whereby we shall be engaged to pray the 120*th* Psalm *against them.*

A

A POSTSCRIPT.

BEcauſe we are ſo highly reproached by our Adverſaries for Antinomians in the great Point of Juſtication, I thought it very needful to tranſcribe ſome few Paſſages out of the Writings of that renowned Servant of Jeſus Chriſt, Mr. *Tho. Shephard*, whom none of our bittereſt Opponents can call an Antinomian.

He ſhews how Chriſt redeems, 1. By Satisfaction. 2. By ſtrong Hand. 1. By Satisfaction, in paying a Price for us, 1 *Cor.* 6. *ult.* Hence Chriſt ſatisfieth Juſtice.

1. By ſtanding in the room of all them whom Mercy decreeth to ſave. A Surety ſtandeth in the room of a Debtor, *Heb.* 7. 22. As the firſt *Adam* ſtood in the room of all Mankind fallen, ſo Chriſt ſtandeth in the room of all Men riſing, or to be reſtored again.

2. By taking from them, in whoſe room he ſtood, the eternal Guilt of all their Sins, and by aſſuming the Guilt of all their Sins unto himſelf, 2 *Cor.* 5. 22. Hence *Luther* ſaid Chriſt was the greateſt Sinner by Imputation.

3. By bearing the Curſe and Wrath of God kindled againſt Sin; for God is ſo holy, that when he ſeeth Sin ſticking only by Imputation to his own Son, he will not ſpare him, but his Wrath and Curſe muſt he bear, *Gal.* 3. 13. Chriſt drinks up the Cup of all the Elect at one Draught, which they ſhould have been ſipping, and drinking, and tormented with Millions of Years.

4. By bringing into the Preſence of God perfect Righteouſneſs, *Rom.* 5. 11. For this alſo God's Juſtice required Perfection, Conformity to the Law, as

as well as perfect Satisfaction, in ſuffering for the Wrong offered to the Lawgiver. Juſtice requiring theſe Four Things, Chriſt ſatisfies Juſtice, by performing them, and ſo pays the Price.

2. Chriſt is a Redeemer by a ſtrong Hand. The firſt Redemption by Price finiſhed in Chriſt's Perſon at his Reſurrection, the ſecond is begun by the Spirit in Man's Vocation, and ended at the Day of Judgment, *&c. Sinc. Conv. p.* 102, 103.

By Satisfaction I underſtand the whole Obedience of Chriſt unto the very Death, both Active and Paſſive, by which we are juſtified, *Heb.* 10. 10. *Phil.* 2. 8. *&c.*

This Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, is not that of the Godhead; (for then what need was there for Chriſt to do or ſuffer?) but that which was wrought in the Manhood: And hence it is finite in it ſelf, tho' infinite in value, in that it was the Righteouſneſs of ſuch a Perſon.

This Righteouſneſs of God may be conſider'd two ways. 1. Abſolutely in it ſelf. 2. Reſpectively, as done for us.

Chriſt's abſolute Righteouſneſs is not imputed to us, as he is Mediator, Head of the Church, having the Spirit without meaſure, *&c.* Theſe things are applied for our Good, but are not imputed as our Righteouſneſs. Here the Objections [ſuch as theſe, if Chriſt's Righteouſneſs be imputed to us, then we are Mediators, Heads of the Church, *&c.*] vaniſheth.

2. The reſpective or diſpenſative Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which ſome call *Juſtitia fide juſſoria*, [Suretiſhip Righteouſneſs] is that whereby Chriſt is juſt for us, in fulfilling the Law, in bearing God's Image we once had, and have now loſt by Sin.

And

And thus we are truly ſaid to be as Righteous as Chriſt by Imputation, becauſe he kept the Law for us; and here obſerve, that the Queſtion is not, whether all that Chriſt did or had is imputed to us as our Righteouſneſs? But whether all that he did for us as a Surety, in fulfilling the Law, be not in Subſtance our Righteouſneſs? Becauſe then we are juſtified by his working Miracles, preaching Sermons, *&c.* Which is to caſt Stumbling-blocks before the Blind; ſo that tho' Chriſt doth not beſtow his Perſonal Wiſdom and Juſtice upon another, yet what hinders but that which Chriſt doth by his Wiſdom and Righteouſneſs for another, the ſame ſhould ſtand good for him for whom it is done? For thus it is among Men.

Chriſt's Eſſential Righteouſneſs, Infinite Wiſdom, Fulneſs of the Spirit without Meaſure, *&c.* is not imputed to us, yet theſe have conſpired together to do that for us, and ſuffer that for us, whereby we come to be righteous before God, *Jer.* 23.6. This Righteouſneſs therefore imputed to us juſtifies us, *Rom.* 5. 18. we are ſaid to be made righteous in him, not the Righteouſneſs of God, whereby God is juſt, but whereby we are juſt, oppoſed to the Righteouſneſs of Man, called our own, *Rom.* 10. 3. *Rom.* 1. 17. Not Righteouſneſs from him, (as the Papiſts dream) but Righteouſneſs in him. *Sound Believer*, *p.* 265, 266.

ERRATA.

PAge 14. l. 2. ab. ult. r. *appealed.* p. 15. l. 5. r. *what neceſſary.* p. 16. l. 13. r. *not taken.* p. 20. l. 5. ab. ult. r. *ponitur.* p. 23. l. 6. ab. ult. r. *not found.* p. 24. l. 22. f. *Men*, r. *more.* p. 43. l. 13. r. *to the Sinner.* p. 49. l. 1. r. *Gods.* p. 61. l. 8. r. *Acquaints.* p. 69. l. 18. r. *meritorious.* p. 76. l. 7. r. *ſo as to bare.* l. 16. 19. 20. r. ἁμαρτία and ἁμαρτίας. l. 21. r. עון. p. 87. l. 6. r. 23. 21. l. 9. dele, *at Sins.* l. 21. r. *ſo as.*

To

To my old Acquaintance Mr. John Humphry.

Reverend Sir,

THE former Civilities that I have receiv'd from you, in ſending your Books concerning the Doctrine of Juſtification to me, which I always read, and ſeriouſly conſidered, knowing you to be a Man of Thought, and plain-hearted, *ſine fuco*, which ſome Men are too much ſtarch'd with. Theſe, I ſay, firſt engaged me in this Undertaking, for which I muſt crave your Excuſe, [looking upon this as the beſt Returns] that I am your Apponent in the Doctrine you have deliver'd in the ſaid Books, and laboured ſtrenuouſly to defend; for you know the old proverbial Saying, *Amicus Plato, Amicus Ariſtotiles ſed magis Amica Veritas*; I hope you will not (nor Mr. *Clerk*, whom I join with you as one that pleadeth the ſame bad Cauſe,) have any reaſon to complain of uncivil Treatment; for if you find any thing pungent, it is not in relation to your Perſons, but to ſuch things in your Tenents, which I conſcienciouſly take to be very pernicious to the grand Truths of the Goſpel, that I have, thro' the Riches of the Grace of God thankfully receiv'd, and not a little experienced the Conſolations in Days of great Trial and Temptation, and therefore can't ſee any reaſon from all that you or your Copartner in this Controverſie hath ſaid, to part with thoſe great Doctrines which you oppoſe, nor any way approve of the new Scheme which you and others have held forth to the World of late; I need not tell you how contrary it is to the Doctrine of our firſt Reformers, to the Experiences of the moſt eminent Chriſtians, and how greedily ſwallowed by Men of Popiſh, Arminian and Socinian Principles.

There was two things, eſpecially of weight with me, that obliged me to this labour. 1. The publick Intereſt and Concern of the Kingdom and Goſpel of Chriſt in the World, which I deſire to have a moſt ſpecial regard unto; inſomuch, that the leaſt and moſt favoura-

ble that I can ſay of the Propagators and Promoters of your Opinions in this Neonomian Doctrine, is, that they have been only applauded Captains by Men of blinded Minds, and corrupt Principles, for the conducting of the People back again into our Spiritual *Egypt*, which thro' the tender Mercies of the moſt High, they began to be delivered from by the Reformation; and if we once come to this, that the Doctrine of the Imputation of *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is as incredible a thing as the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation*, as your great General hath aſſerted, and your ſelf have inſinuated, we may ſay, Good night to the Proteſtant Religion; and to the Papiſts or Atheiſts (as now moſt appears in the Iſſue) take all. I need not inſtance how apt Men of your Principles have been to diſpence with all the parts of inſtituted Worſhip, inſomuch, that it is a hard thing to know what is Sin by your new Law; but I ſhall not expatiate as I could upon this Point. The ſecond thing that had not a little Influence upon me, was, the Commiſeration that I can't but have to your own Soul, and the Souls of others, looking upon your Deviation from the Truth in theſe great Points to be by Fundamental Errors, and ſuch as endanger the Eternal Life promiſed in the Goſpel, if a Man live and die in the Cordial Belief and Embracement of them, and may be juſtly reckoned among the ſtrong Deluſions which God doth judicially give up thoſe to who receive not the Truth in the Love of it. It may be you may have read a Pamphlet, entitled, *A true Relation of the chief Paſſages between Mr.* Anthony Wotton, [the firſt Propagator of Neonom. in *England*, ſo far as I can find] *and Mr.* George Walker, *An. Dom.* 1611. *uſq; ad An.* 1615. *by* George Walker, *for the vindicating himſelf from ſome Imputations laid upon him by Mr.* Thomas Gataker. Wherein amongſt other remarkable Accounts that he gives of the unſound doctrinal Opinions which he faithfully oppoſed, and the moſt unfair Dealings he met with from Mr. *Gataker*, and ſome others, in countenancing of *Wotton*'s Doctrine, and prevaricating in thoſe Controverſies. *P.* 25. He hath this Relation: 'One

'thing

'thing I cannot omit, which was a ſtrong Motive to 'move divers godly People in *London* to abhor Mr. *Wot-* 'ton's Opinions; *That was the ſharp Cenſure which* 'that holy Man of God, Mr. Alexander Richardſon, *gave* 'againſt them on his Death-bed, and which Mr. *John* 'Barlow did report to divers from his Mouth. Mr. 'Richardſon being ready to leave this World, Mr. *Barlow*, 'who had often before reſorted to him for Direction 'in his Studies, [as divers young Divines did, ſome of 'which he mentions, *P.* 6.) and Reſolution of Doubts 'in many Points of Divinity, was at that time preſent 'with him, and told him that he had heard me the 'Sabbath before propounding the Doctrine of Juſtifica- 'tion, to be laid open out of *Rom.* 5, and to be main- 'tained againſt Papiſts, Socinians, and other Hereticks; 'ſome of which were of late revived in the City, and 'withal deſired to know his Judgment concerning 'Mr. *Wotton*'s Opinions, *who denied Chriſt's fulfilling the* 'Law for Juſtification of Believers, and the Imputation of 'his Righteouſneſs, and held Faith to be imputed in a pro- 'per Senſe without a Trope.* Mr. *Richardſon* anſwered 'and ſaid, *Take theſe Words of me a dying Man; I have* 'read, and well weighed Mr. Wotton's *Papers, and Opi-* 'nions, and I know them to be ſo peſtilent and dangerous, 'that whoſoever liveth and dieth in the Belief of them, 'ſhall never enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* Commend 'me to Mr. *Walker*, and deſire him from me (as being 'my laſt Requeſt to him) *to be couragious in the Cauſe of* 'God, and for that ſaving Truth, which he hath undertа- 'ken to maintain againſt thoſe dangerous and deadly Er- 'rors lately ſet on foot by Mr.* Wotton. This Meſſage 'being delivered unto me before divers Witneſſes, ſome 'of which are alive to teſtifie it, did much encourage 'me, and make me more bold to lay open the A- 'bominations of Mr. *Wotton*'s Opinions publickly in 'my Sermons, without Fear or Regard of the Slanders 'and Revilings of his factious and furious Diſciples. This was *An.* 1613.

Now

Now ſuppoſing that you will not lay much ſtreſs upon the Judgment of one of the moſt holy, ſerious and learned Divines ſince the Reformation, as it appears ſuch weighs little with you; let me be ſo bold as to ask you one Queſtion, *Whether upon the matureſt Conſideration you do believe you ſhall in your dying Hour dare to venture your Eternal State upon the Bottom that you have laid?* And *Laſtly*, Altho' I am ſo much diſſatisfied in your Doctrine, that I muſt needs acknowledge your plain-heartedneſs in the Defence of your Doctrine, (as alſo Mr. *Clerk*'s) yet you do not endeavour to cover and obſcure the Meaning and true Deſign of the Doctrine of Neonom. but have given it to us unmask'd in its proper Colours; *Viz.* That the genuine and proper Nature thereof lyes in the ſetting aſide of the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and the Imputation thereof, to the Juſtification of a Sinner before God, and to advance the inherent Righteouſneſs of Man into the Room and Place thereof.* Moreover I muſt acknowledge you have done right to Truth in what you ſay of the Union that the *Nonconformiſts* made between *Presbyterians* and *Independants*, that they were extreamly out in it. And likewiſe in the plain Proof that you have made, that it is *moſt abſurd to hold and aſſert, that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed* in ſe, *and in the Effects too*, and that there can be no *mixed Medium*; either we muſt hold that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed *in ſe* and *per ſe* to us for Juſtification, or the *Effects thereof only in our inherent Obedience*, for the Reaſons you give with full Demonſtration. To ſay no more of this now, but only that I think you have effectually ended Diſcord upon that Point; Sir, I ſhall no longer detain you from the enſuing Diſcourſe, but ſubſcribe my ſelf.

Yours in all Truth and Faithfulneſs,

J. C.

THE

THE DOCTRINE OF Juſtification Explained and Vindicated, &c.

CHAPTER I.

Of the Doctrine of Juſtification, and the Neonomian Oppoſition thereto.

Section 1. *The Article of the Aſſembly.* §. 2. *How oppoſed in the univerſality of Grace, and qualification of the perſon juſtified.* §. 3. *How* Neonomianiſm *agrees with* Papiſts *and* Quakers *in Juſtification by Infuſed Righteouſneſs.* §. 4. *How they oppoſe in Pardon of Sin and Imputing Righteouſneſs.* §. 5. *Their agreement with the* Papiſts *in Juſtification by Works.* §. 6. *The* Papiſts *Talk of a New Law.* §. 7. Quakers *Doctrine of Juſtification.* §. 8. *The* Socinian *Doctrine of Juſtification.* §. 9. *The* Arminian *Juſtification.* §. 10. *Inference.* §. 11. *They aſſert, Juſtification not for Chriſt's ſake alone.* 12. Neonomians *affirm, Imputation of the Act of Faith.* §. 13. *They deny the Imputation of Chriſts Obedience and Satisfaction.* §. 14. *How they account Faith a qualifying Condition.* §. 15. *Concluſion.*

Sect. 1. Aſſembl. conf. cap. 11. §. 1. *Thoſe whom God effectually calleth, he alſo freely juſtifieth, not by infuſing Righteouſneſs into them, but by pardoning their Sins, and by accounting*

and accepting their Persons as righteous: Not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; nor by imputing Faith it self, the Act of believing, nor any other Evangelical Obedience to them as their righteousness, but by imputing the Obedience and Satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith, which Faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God.

To this Doctrine here delivered with the greatest Exactness, according to the Word of God, is the Doctrine of *Neonomianism* diametrically opposite, as will abundantly appear.

§. 2. They say, *Whom God effectually calleth he justifieth.*] Mr. *B.* saith, 'God justifieth all the World; and he and Mr. *H.* 'That 'Christ redeemed all the World, in which there are Millions that 'were never, or will be effectually called. 2. That *God freely justifieth.*] This is fuller expressed in the Larger Catechism, Q. 70. *Justification is an act of God's free grace unto Sinners,* Rom. 3. 21, 23, 24. for the *free Grace* is demonstrated in the Object that Justification falls upon. Justification considered in it self is an act of Justice, but the Free Grace lies in bringing Justification upon a Sinner, as such, not as qualified by righteousness of his own, under any Denomination whatsoever; Christ *died for the ungodly,* for *enemies,* while yet sinners, *Rom.* 5. 6, 7, 8, 9. it is such *chap.* 3. that are said to be *justified* (chap. 4. 5.) *by free Grace*; it is such that have *sinned, and come short of the glory of God,* as all, he saith, have, both *Jews and Gentiles*; such as are described, from *v.* 10. of whom *none are righteous, no not one,* but full of all sin and wickedness, as expressed with the highest aggravation unto *v.* 19. Now our *Neonomians* say, its of Free Grace, because Justification is *an Instance of Grace*; but by Mr. *Cl*'s. favour, it must be in the Justification of a Sinner, not of a just one; and therefore its said *freely by Grace,* because he hath nothing, nor brings any thing in or from himself. 2. He saith, 'Its in respect of what is required of us, or 'in us, Faith is wrought in us, and its of Free Grace that he accepts 'of Faith, and imputes it to us for righteousness: This by the *Assembly* is rejected as False Doctrine; altho Faith, and all the Graces of the Spirit, are of Grace, yet neither Faith, or any of them, are our righteousness for Justification, neither doth God accept it as such, nor impute it: Mr. *Cl.* mightily perverts *Rom.* 4. 16. *therefore it is of faith*; '*i. e.* the righteousness before spoken of, *is such as he received by faith (he saith not therefore it is faith) that it might be of grace,* because as Grace gives freely, so Faith receiveth freely, and is not so proud as to call it self, righteousness, but gladly, humbly and thankfully receives the gift of righteousness, which Grace bestows, and Justice accepts and imputes to Justification.

§. 3. *Not by infusing righteousness into them.*] The *Assembly* doth here

here exclude the *Popish* Justification, at which Mr. *H.* inveighs, and so doth *J. G.* for indeed there's but a pair of Shears between the *Papists* and *Neonomians*; for the *Papists* mean only, That we have the righteousness for Justification by infusion, and so says the other; they say indeed, Infusion is of Sanctification, and it is so, and we say, Justification is only a relative Grace, as it finds nothing in the justified, so it puts nothing; but the *Neonomians* say, *It must find a righteousness infused, and there implanted in the justified, for which he is justified, or by which*; its all one, as we shall make appear anon; in a word, tho the *Neonomians* say, *The infusion of grace is not justification*, yet they say, *Grace infused is our righteousness for Justification*; and here they do concur with the *Papists*, *Quakers* and others in confounding Justification and Sanctification together.

§. 4. *But by pardoning their sins.*] The *Neonomians* will not have Pardon to be any part of Justification, but an effect of it only; we affirm it to be an essential part of Justification. [*By accounting and accepting their persons as righteous.*] The *Neonomians* say, its by accounting and accepting their *imperfect obedience* for righteousness; God's Justification is first of the Person, and then of their Services, as *Abel*'s, but their Justification is first of their Services, and so it is always in legal Justification, never in that of Free Grace; for in a meer Legal Justification, Persons cannot be accepted before the Work done, but the Person is accepted for the Work sake.

Not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them.] The *Papists*, *Neonomians*, *Quakers*, *Socinians*, *Arminians*, all say its for or by what's wrought in us, or done by us, *Pap. Conf. Trid. There is one only formal cause of Justification, and that is the righteousness of God, not that whereby he is righteous, but whereby he makes us righteous, with which we being endowed, are renewed in the spirit of our minds, and are truly called righteous, and are righteous, &c.* Upon which *Bellarmine* saith the State of the whole Controversie may be reduc'd to this plain Question, *Whether our inherent righteousness be the formal cause of our own absolute Justification?* which he maintains in the Affirmative, and this is the Question in Controversie exactly, which our *Neonomians* plead for in the like manner, tho some more obscurely and sophistically, but others more honestly in speaking out plainly what they mean, such as Mr. *B.* Mr. *H.* and *Mr. Cl. Bellarmine* also blames *Kemnitius* for dealing fraudulently in not distinguishing between *propter* and *per*, saying with the Council of *Trent*, 'That Christ's Righteousness is the *propter*, the *cause* for which we 'we are justified, and our own inherent Righteousness is the *per*, 'the formal cause *by* which we are justified. This Distinction *Mr. H.* having taken up from *Bellarmine*, makes very much of. More of it anon.

§. 5. Take one or two for all, to avoid tediousness to the Reader. Mr. *H.* in *Medioc. p.* 42. *Herein doth appear the ground of reconciliation between the* Papists *and us in this point*; the sum of what he saith is, *Provided they say that the works they plead for our righteousness, be the works of the new law, and not of the old, we are agreed*, and then tells us, *That Gods judging a man to have performed the condition of the Covenant* (i. e. the New Law) *is the accounting and declaring him righteous, That righteousness which makes a man righteous, and denominates him righteous, is that righteousness which does make God account him righteous, and that is the righteousness which he doth. Note it, for it is express*; and this he saith is not the righteousness of the law of works, but of the law of grace, which he saith *is a righteousness which he doth, but not work in doing*, which is pretty absurd, that a man should do works of righteousness and not work; but the meaning is, he doth not work perfect works (I will not wrong him:) But do not those that work imperfect works work? *Yea*, saith he, *they that do absolutely sinful works, are called workers of iniquity.* A little after he tells us, *Christ's Redemption was to bring in a New Law—— for when Man fell it was impossible he should be righteous any more unless there were a new Law brought in, by performance whereof he might attain to that again which he lost——now this was the main business of Christ's Redemption, the procuring a new law, or another law with lower Terms, which some men performing, they do thereby become righteous, and so have righteousness, according to that Law imputed to them for Remission and life eternal* —— And thus you see what everlasting righteousness Christ brought in, *Dan.* 9. and in his Piece, *Of Righteousness*, which comes forth with Episco. Approbation, p. 3. *It is true against the* Papists, *there is no such righteousness inherent, as to render God appeased with the sinner, or that the Conscience can rest on it* [then it is good for nothing] *as that* propter quod *he is forgiven or saved* [by his favour *Bellarmine* doth not say it is] *but that Christ's righteousness is the* propter quam. Therefore the *Papists* and they are agreed in this sence. ——*It is true also against the common* Protestant, [therefore the *Neonomians* are not *Protestants*, unless such as have *causa formalis* of *Papists*] *that there is not any righteousness without us that can be made ours, so as we should be accounted righteous in another's righteousness, or be that thing* per quod *we are justified, there is no such matter in reality, but in notion only*—— *This righteousness, as imperfect as it is* (*wrought by the Spirit*) *is that, and must be that which is the form* per quam, *he is accepted and justified, we grant the righteousness of Christ is the meritorious cause* per quam *we are pardoned and saved.*

§. 6. About the New Law there's little difference between the *Papists* and *Neonomians*, tho the *Papiste* are on the surer side of

of the Notion, Mr. *Fox Mart.* about the difference between Ancient *Rome* and present, *p.* 34. tells us, *The Church of* Rome *teach the People that there's no difference between* Moses *and* Christ, *save only that* Moses *was the giver of the old law, but* Christ *the giver of a new and more perfect law.* And its most rational, that the new law should be a more perfect law, and not a law of imperfection; we do not mend perfect things, and if there be any reason for particular ends, its with those things that more perfectly answer those ends, and therefore their remedying law ought to be perfecter and most compleat.

§. 7. Next a-kin to these men are the *Quakers* in their most refined Doctrine, put out in the name of *Barclay*, but I heard Mr. *Keath*, that was a *Neonomian Quaker*, say, *Barclay*'s Book was chiefly his work. 'Works are necessary to Justification as well as 'Faith, *James* 2. both equally required to Justification; works of 'the Law are excluded as done by us, *Tit.* 3. 5,6,7. [*this is Mr.*H. *just*] 'To be justified by Grace is to be justified or saved by Rege'neration, which cannot exclude Works wrought by Grace and 'by the Spirit, 1 *Cor.* 6 11. The law gives not power to obey, 'and so falls short of Justification; but there's power under the 'Gospel by which the Law comes to be fulfilled inwardly, *Rom.* 8. '3, 4. Works are the Condition upon which Life is proposed un'der the New Coveuant. Tho we place Remission of Sins in the 'Righteousness and Obedience of Christ performed in the Flesh, 'as to what pertains to the remote procuring cause, and that we 'hold our selves formally justified by Christ formed and brought 'forth in us; yet can we not (as some *Protestants* have done un'warily) exclude works from Justification, for tho properly we 'are not justified for them, yet are we justified in them, *&c.*

§. 8. The *Socinians* say, 'No other Imputation is in our eter'nal Salvation than that whoever sincerely obeys the Commands 'of Christ is from them accounted of God righteous, *Socin. de serv.* 'When God is said to impute Faith for Righteousness, the mean'ing is, that God hath so great a value for Faith, that he esteems 'it for a Righteousness to Justification, *Crel.* on *Gal.* 3. 6. And Mr. *B.* saith, 'I abhor the Opinion that Christ's righteousness 'given us is all without us, *Preface to Doct. of Chr.* p. 3. but more of this in what follows.

§. 9. The *Arminians* bring up the Rear, and I shall name the Man from whom I can prove Mr. *B.* hath taken up most of his corrupt Notions about *General Redemption* and *Justification*, and its *F. G.* 'The Question in precise Terms is this, Whether the Faith 'of him that truly believes in Christ, or whether the righteous'ness of Christ himself—— be that which God imputes to a Belie-

'ver for righteousness, or unto Righteousness in his Justification, *F. G. of Justification, p.* 7. he concludes it is faith—— 'As a Mer-'chant that grows rich by such a Commodity, *i. e.* he grew rich 'by the Gain and Return he made of that Commodity—— So we 'may be said to be justified by the righteousness of Christ, and 'yet not have the righteousness it self upon us by Imputation, or 'otherwise, but only a righteousness procured or purchased by it 'really and essentially differing from it, *p.* 12. This Righteousness 'of Christ is not that that is imputed unto any man for righteous-'ness, but is that for which righteousness is imputed to every 'man that believeth—— *Paul* neither eat his Fingers, nor spun 'out the flesh of his hands into cloathing, and yet was both fed 'and cloathed with them [Here's the true sense of being ju-stified by the effects of Christ's Righteousness.] 'So may 'a Believer be said to be cloathed with the Righteousness of 'Christ, and yet the righteousness of Christ not be his cloathing 'but only that which procured this cloathing unto him. *Chap.* 7. *p.* 88. is to evince, 'That that which God imputes for Righteous-'ness in Justification is not the Righteousness of Christ himself (in the sense refused in the First Chapter,) 'but faith in Christ. In the conclusion of the Chap. he says, 'If God in the New Covenant 'of the Gospel (*i. e.* the New Law) requires Faith in Christ for 'our Justification, instead of the righteousness of the Law in the 'old, and this faith will not pass with him in account for such 'righteousness, both his Commandment and Covenant for believ-'ing, and the Obedience it self of believing, will become void, 'and of none effect.

§. 10. You see by these instances, that by this Doctrine the *Neonomians* fall into that Sink of Errour, that the highest opposers of the Gospel of Christ have professed; its no doubt but they will cease inveighing against the *Quakers*, as introducers of *Popery*, but rather applaud them, and bring them into their Pulpits.

§ 11. *But for Christ's sake alone.*] This they deny and say, 'Our 'Justification passively taken, that which we do our selves thro 'Grace is this our formal righteousness, and that is the conditi-'on of our Justification actively taken (*i. e.* the righteousness of 'Christ the meritorious cause) So that in a large sense here is two 'righteousnesses for our Justification, Christ's and ours, *p.* 6. Mr. *Cl.* hath a *Chapter* to prove how the Righteousness of Christ concurs to our Justification, the sum of all is this, 'That by the 'Merits of Christ's Death, he has purchased this Priviledge for 'us among others, that sincere Faith should be accounted for 'righteousness, and that God will account us righteous if we be

'possest

'poſſeſt thereof, *p.* 35. Chriſt hath done his part, but hath ap-
'pointed us a neceſſary part which muſt be done by our ſelves;
'this is not to ſupply any deficiency in Chriſt [*i. e.* he hath done
well enough for the part alotted him] 'but it is that which
'ſubordinately is required of us as the condition of Pardon and
'Life by his own Law or Covenant of Grace, and ſo far [as a
part] 'it is imputed to us for righteouſneſs, *Scr. G. p.* 35. From
what hath been quoted before, it is plain the reſt alſo do hold,
that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs at beſt doth but concur to our Juſtifi-
cation, it is not that only whereby we are juſtified. See Mr. *Cl.*
Chap. 13.

§. 12. *Not by imputing faith it ſelf, the act of believing, or any other Evangelical Obedience to them for righteonſneſs.*] All this the *Neonomians* in all their Writings deny, Mr. *B.* in his *S. G. def. p.* 32. quæries, 'Whether Faith be imputed to us for righ-
'teouſneſs, or Chriſt's Righteouſneſs believed on? *A.* A ſtrange
'and bold Quæry—— 'Read over the Text and put but [Chriſt's
'Righteouſneſs every where inſtead of the word Faith] and ſee
'what a ſcandalous Paraphraſe you will make ——to have righte-
'ouſneſs imputed, plainly ſignifieth to be reckoned or judged
'righteous, and it is ſtrange that it muſt not be our own righte-
'ouſneſs that is imputed and reckoned to us as our own. The ſame
ſay Mr. *H.* and Mr. *Cl.* This Faith that is our righteouſneſs they
will have the ſame with our Evangelical Obedience, as contain-
ing all in it. So Mr. *B.* 'Faith by which we are juſtified is one
'moral act, containing many phyſical acts, even our fiducial con-
'ſent to the Baptiſmal Covenant, and Dedication of our ſelves to
'God the Father, *p.* 42. Mr. *Cl.* 'Faith is our ſubordinate Go-
'ſpel-righteouſneſs, he gives his reaſons, *p.* 64. *Mr. H.* 'When a
'man performs the Evangelick Condition, it is the Evangelick
'Law (or God by it as his inſtrument) makes him, or conſtitutes
'him righteous, and being thereby ſo made, God muſt account
'him ſo; this conſtitutive Juſtification preceeds Pardon and Life
'in order of nature. *J. G.* denys that Faith juſtifies in relation
to its Object, tho it cannot be ſeparated from it, but by vertue of
the intervention of ſome Law, Covenant or Decree, *i. e.* as a con-
dition of the new Law in the *Neonomian* ſenſe. *Mr. H.* in his
right. of God, p. 54. 'Our Effectual Calling doth enter our Juſti-
'fication, for the Works of it, Faith, Repentance, new Obedience,
'are imputed to us for that righteouſneſs that juſtifies us, and our
'Juſtification and inchoate righteouſneſs does enter, and is the in-
'fancy of Glory. I need not blot Paper by quoting the Council
of *Trent*; briefly, they damn any man that ſaith, that a man is
juſtified without the righteouſneſs that Chriſt did merit for us,

whereby he is formally juſt, and damn ſuch as ſay, that a man is juſtified only by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, or Remiſſion of Sins, without inherent Grace and Charity.

§. 13. *But by imputing the Obedience and Satisfaction of Chriſt unto them.*] *Mr. H.* in his *Right &c. p.* 34. ſays to this part of the *Aſſemblies deſcript. of Juſtification*, and ſeems to flatter them a little, and thinks their *Catechiſm* may ſerve the People, yea, that a groſſer ſort of the knowledge of the Principles of Religion is better for ordinary People than more exact, whereby you may ſee what high thoughts and apprehenſions he hath of the exactneſs of his groſs Divinity. 'In Juſtification I acknowledge 'a forgiveneſs, and an imputation of Chriſt's Obedience, but I do 'not acknowledge either as our formal righteouſneſs, Forgiveneſs 'is a benefit we receive, but not the formal reaſon. I acknow-'ledge Chriſt's righteouſneſs imputed *ſub genere cauſæ efficientis* '& *modum meriti*, received by faith, but in the merit of it only. 'And I give notice, that thinking *More* doth ſay, that Chriſt's 'righteouſneſs *in ſe*, is made ours legally (tho he diſowns it as 'phyſically and morally) that man muſt make it juſtifie us *ſub ra-'tione cauſa formalis*, which is an unadviſed Poſition, which I look 'upon as that πρῶτον ψεῦδος of our former great Divines, which 'gave the riſe to *Antinomianiſm*. Now what a happineſs is it that ſo great a Divine is riſen up, to find out ſuch an Error in the very heart of our *Reformation*, in our great Divines, and indeed in our *Proteſtant* Religion, that we have been all under a Cheat and Deluſion in this grand Point of Life and Salvation, building upon a wrong righteouſneſs for Juſtification. Again he ſaith, 'That we 'ſhould be juſtified by faith, was obtained by Chriſt's Righteouſ-'neſs or Performance; but it is our Faith, not Chriſt's Perfor-'mance, is imputed unto us for righteouſneſs in our Juſtification, 'Chriſt's righteouſneſs is that for which, not that by which *cauſa* '*propter quam.* not *per quam*, we have this benefit, that upon be-'lieving we are juſtified: to the ſame purpoſe he hath words above an hundred times. *Mr. R. B.* 'God never judgeth falſly, 'but knoweth all things to be what they are, and therefore he re-'puteth Chriſt's *Mediatorial Righteouſneſs* and Sacrifice to be the 'meritorious cauſe for which we are juſtified by the law of Grace, 'ſo he truly reputeth our Faith and Repentance, and Covenant-'conſent to be our moral qualification for the gift, and our holineſs 'and perſeverance to be our moral qualification for final Juſtificati-'on, which qualifications being the matter of the Law of Grace, and 'Condition of its Promiſe, is ſo far our righteouſneſs, therefore God 'may be ſaid in this ſenſe, to impute Righteouſneſs to us [*i. e. our own*] and to impute Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to us [*i. e. as to the*

effects

effects] 'to impute our faith to us for righteouſneſs. See *the end of Controv. p.* 257, 258. and 260, 261. *Scr. G. d. p.* 61. 70, 71. *Socinus.* 'No other imputation is in our eternal Salvation than 'that whoſoever ſincerely obeys the Commands of Chriſt is from 'them accounted of God as righteous, *De Serv.* This is the expreſs ſenſe of the *Neonomians.*

§. 14. *They receiving and reſting on him and his righteouſneſs by faith.*] The *Neonomians* ſay, 'to be juſtified by it as that which 'God hath promiſed Juſtification on, as the qualifying condition. 'and ſaith the *quæ & quâ* is a quibbling and juggling about a meer 'ſound of words in a ludicrous Diſputation; he ſaith it juſtifies not *inſtrumentaliter*, for that is the τὸ *credere* in *ſpecie*; Faith in Chriſt doth not juſtifie *qua talis*, as that Faith, but it is that qualifying condition which the Promiſe annexeth Juſtification to, *Scr. G. d. p.* 42, 43.

Mr. *Cl. chap.* 12. §. 8. 'From hence I infer, that juſtifying 'Faith is the ſame thing in ſubſtance with Effectual Calling, Re'pentance, Regeneration, Converſion, Sanctification. Renovation, 'Oc. *F. G.* 'It is the common Plea, that Faith juſtifieth in rela'tion to its Object, its not receiving, but lawful receiving that ju'ſtifieth, and therefore it juſtifieth by vertue of that law or agree'ment men are under, *i. e.* as a Covenant-condition; therefore he peremptorily denys that Faith juſtifies in relation to its Object, and our *Neonomians* are one with him, ſee him *Of Juſtification.*

Bellarmine alſo ſpendeth much Paper, *That Faith alone doth not juſtifie, but that Fear, Hope, Love, and every Grace doth the ſame.*

§. 15. Thoſe Points wherein the *Neonomians* declare themſelves diametrically oppoſite to the *Aſſembly*, and other *Proteſtants* in the Doctrine of the Obedience and Satisfaction of Chriſt, muſt be matter of another Treatiſe, it being too much to come within the compaſs of theſe Sheets; likewiſe, there are two Points which I have already publickly inſiſted on. 1. In ſhewing the Nullity of any New Law with Sanction. 2. To diſprove their *Univerſal Redemption*, and ſhew the Abſurdity thereof, tho more may be ſaid of both (God willing) hereafter. And the *Aſſembly*, and we with them, aſſerting the Imputation of the active and paſſive Obedience of Chriſt to the Juſtification of a Sinner, and the *Neonomians* denying the active righteouſneſs to have any influence on our Juſtification, no further than as to the fitneſs of his Perſon to the exerciſe of his Mediatorial Office, falling in with *Piſcator*, *Gataker* and others in this Point, and cannot be handled here, but muſt be matter of after-conſideration in treating of Satisfaction. Let not the Reader take it for granted that we grant Mr. *Clark* that Point, *viz. the denial of the active righteouſneſs of Chriſt in our Juſtification*, wherein he hath ſpent a great part of his Treatiſe.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of Juſtification.

§. 1. *Wherein we are agreed.* §. 2. *Juſtification, what in Scripture acceptation.* §. 3. *What it ſuppoſeth.* §. 4. *God juſtifies actions.* §. 5. *Such a fruit of Juſtification before God.* §. 6. *Of* Rahab. §. 7. *Of Juſtification* in foro Conſcientiæ §. 8. *Of the Conditions.* §. 9. *Of Commutative Juſtice.* § 10. *Of a Compact.* §. 11. *Of Grace purchaſed.* §. 12. *Of the Purchaſe of the Covenant.* §. 13. *Whether God be a Debtor.* §. 14. *Particularly aſſerted againſt Mr.* H.

§. 1. I Shall not detain the Reader in criticizing on the ſignification of *Juſtification* in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Language, it amounting to what our *Engliſh* word means, and our adverſaries in a great meaſure agreeing with us therein (tho differing enough in the *modus* (as appears in the foregoing *Chapter*) that *Juſtification* is directly oppoſed to *Condemnation*, That it is a forinſick or Law-Term, and that properly it is a Law-Sentence, diſtinctly and *per ſe* underſtood. That God is the great Juſtifier. That the Perſon juſtified is always upon the account of ſome righteouſneſs of that Law that juſtifieth. That this righteouſneſs muſt be legally his that is juſtified, *i. e.* imputed to him without denial of it ſelf; and that Juſtification is the ſentential pronouncing a perſon righteous and accepted by the Lawgiver, free from condemnation, righteous in his ſight, and enſtated in all advantages that this righteouſneſs of his brings him into. Thus far I take it we are agreed, what little wordy differences there is, we ſhall not concern our ſelves about, nor trouble the Reader with.

§. 2. Juſtification in Scripture, and in our uſual and common acceptation, is any Vindication of a Perſon or Action from a Charge or Accuſation brought in or alledged againſt them, and this in the largeſt ſenſe wherein a man is ſaid to juſtifie God, *Pſal.* 51. 4. Its one mans juſtifying another, or vindicating their actions, and this done by pleading for, or defending them, *Job* 27. 5. and 33. 32. or practically, by doing the ſame thing or worſe, *Ezek.* 10. 51. 55. Or a man is ſaid to juſtifie himſelf, *Job* 32. *Luke* 10. 29.

§. 3.

§. 3. Justification being allowed to be a Forinsick Term, it must always suppose a *Forum* or Court where it is. And all Justification must be supposed to be in one at least, or all these Courts, *Forum Dei, Mundi, Conscientiæ*, a true Believer is sometimes justified in all, as to his State and Actions; sometimes in one, and not in another. The Court, or *Forum Dei*, is where God sits as Law-giver, and righteous Judge of his Law, where every one that is saved must find Acquittance and Acceptance. *Forum Mundi*, is of two kinds, 1. *Common*, wherein the actions of men are judged of, either by Vogue and Reports of the Vulgar, or by the Courts of Judicature among men. 2. It is more special *in Ecclesiis*, to be tried and judged in a Church of Christ. 3. *Forum Conscientiæ*, where God sits a Judge, and brings the Sinner to the Bar, and Trial, and accordingly Sentence of Condemnation or Justification passeth upon a man, or on his Actions. As to the first of these, all men are tried as *unto their State*, and they are there juridically acquitted or condemned *in foro Dei, i. e. legis*, either by a Judgment on their own righteousness, which is called *legal righteousness*, or upon a Judgment on them according to the righteousness of another, called *Evangelical*, because its of absolute promise to a Sinner, and the freest Gift in the World. As to the second *Forum*, the Courts of the World, the World many ways call Courts of Judicature, and will have Judgment upon men, in the former Court the Judgment is always according to truth, but its not so here, for a man may be acquitted there, and condemned here, both Persons and Actions; nay, let me say, a person may be acquitted in *foro Dei*, and yet his Actions justly condemned in *foro humano, i. e. mundi*, but then I do not say, those actions are accepted in *foro Dei*, but are burnt for *Hay and Stubble*, as men do justifie themselves and others in this *foro mundi* very often; so doth God himself justifie his children and their actions that are so condemned by, and ungrateful to the World: God doth as it were come into it, and vindicate his accused Saints, where Satan takes it upon him as his Prerogative to accuse the Brethren, when his Accusations run high, God looks upon his Honour engaged to vindicate such, in those eminent, unaccountable, and condemned Actions which they do for his Names sake. Here we read of God's own vindicating and bearing Testimony to the actions of his children that looked strange in the eye of the World. God's justifying those Actions before the World is called Justification, and their Actions Righteousness; not that the persons were justified thereby, but that they were approved fruits of Christ's Righteousness, received by Faith; yea we find, when God comes into the *Court* of the World to declare Persons or Actions, to be approved

approved by him, its usually in some extraordinary thing wherein they were Eminent, and suffered much thereupon, at least in their good Name, if not otherwise.

§. 4. In this case, God justifies the Act of *Phineas*, in taking upon him to execute Judgment in the case of *Zimri* and *Cosbi*, the action lay condemnable in *Phineas*, as a rash action, which proceeded from an usurped Authority, he being not High-Priest, nor having any particular Commission from *Moses*. This Action God testifies to as a holy and righteous Act, (tho it looked so extrajudicial) and should be looked upon as a righteous act to all Generations. *Phineas* was a justified person long before, *Numb.* 25. 12, 13. *Psal.* 106. 30, 31. So *Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain*, was he not in an accepted and justified state before God? for God first accepted *Abel*, and then his Offering, and because his Offering, notwithstanding God's acceptation, was condemned by *Cain*, and no doubt by his Posterity, *he obtained witness that he was righteous*, ἐπὶ τῷ ἐμαρτυρήθη, whereby he was witnessed unto, for God witnessed *in foro mundi*, to the righteousness of *Abel*, *i.e.* to his Justification, in that he made it appear by his manifested acceptance, undoubtedly Fire came down from Heaven and consumed the Sacrifice; here the Apostle saith, *God testifying of his Gifts*, and this was a testimony of his Person that he was righteous, but this is not the justification of his Person, for if he had not been justified in *foro Dei*, yea *Conscientiæ* too, he could not by faith have offered a Sacrifice so well pleasing to God, wherefore to shew to the World that he was an accepted person, God testifies to his Services. So *Enoch*, he had some eminent Testimony from God before his Translation, against all the calumniating and blaspheming Posterity of *Cain*. So *Noah* also, in his Generation *a Preacher of the righteousness of faith*. he had a Testimony in the Ark, and the Salvation that he and his House had to both the Worlds and yet this Testimony was not that Justification which he had before God, for he was *heir of the righteousness of God by faith*, ἐγένετο κληρονόμος, he was become the heir, not upon building the Ark, but was so before.

§. 5. God's appearing then to witness to the Ways and Actions of his People in the World, which the children of men are still condemning of, and their Persons and Profession for, is not their Justification before God, but an eminent fruit thereof. *Abraham* when he offered up his Son *Isaac*, he exerted the eminent fruit of a tried Faith, which the World would be apt to condemn as one of the heinousest and most unnatural in the World, therefore God justifies this Action of his, and therein recommends him for the most

most Eminent Believer, he *not staggering in his faith of the promise* notwithstanding, *believing that God could raise his son from the dead*, and if he should slay his son, that God would do it rather than not fulfil his Promise. Now I dare appeal to our most ingenuous Opposers, whether they think *Abraham* was not justified before this great Action of his, and what can *James* his Justification be more than God's declaring in *foro mundi*, that this strange action of his, wherein he was a Wonder to the World, and for which he stood ready to be condemned by it, was highly approv'd by him, and an eminent Fruit and Testimony of his Faith. It appears by the context that *James* understood nothing but that a True Faith brings forth Works, witnessing in *foro mundi*, to the truth of it, and *James* 2.10. and that the offender of the Law in one point, is guilty of all, and that he that is saved by faith, is saved by *a lively faith*, such as will shew it self *by works*, and such as God will testifie to by his Word or Providence, or both, *that they are wrought of God*.

§ 6. The like may be said of *Rahab*, The World would condemn her for a treacherous Harlot in betraying her Native Country to destruction: But this action of justified *Rahab* being a signal fruit of her Eminent Faith, is signally owned by God himself, and her strange action justified to the World, that when the Walls of *Jericho* fell, her house stood only, and she saved with the Honour and Renown of an exemplary believer in the Church, yea God honoured her so far, as to come into the Line of the Messiah. Hath not God gloriously justified his Saints, *i. e.* by testifying to their Gifts and Services to the World, whence else hath been that eminent Spirit visible and astonishing to the World, whereby they have not only rejoiced to suffer for the *Name of Jesus in the spoil of their goods*, but *in giving their bodies to death*, and overcame all the Reproaches and Blasphemies of their cruel enemies, by faith in the blood of the Lamb, and Word of the Testimony: Was not that admirable Presence of God with them, not only which we read of *Heb.* 11. but in other Martyrologies. The Witness of God to their Gifts in and to the convincing the World, to which they had never come, had they not been freely justified by God before. I am ashamed to see that Men should think that the Saints in their great Services and Sufferings should be of such servile and base Spirits, as to be bargaining with God by their Works when they were frying in the Flames.

§. 7. There is also a Justification *in foro Conscientiæ*, which is received by faith, and cannot be received but by faith, and its a closing in with the judgment of God according to truth. Justification must be before any person can receive it; the *Assembly*

do

do moſt accurately tell us what *Juſtification by faith* is, *We ſay not, that no man that ſays he believes not his Juſtification is not juſtified, nor every one that ſays he believes it, is juſtified, but we ſay, That every one that believes truly is juſtified, and every one that's juſtified, ſhall believe.*

God's Juſtification of a Sinner, is his Juridical Sentence concerning his Eternal State and Condition, which admits not of *majus* and *minus* in God, but admits of different times of application, and of degrees of manifeſtation; it finds nothing in the creature, nor makes any change but relative, wherein God is firſt in relation, juſtifying and applying that Grace to us, and therefore we are wholly paſſive, till by vertue of Union with Chriſt by the Spirit, the Spirit of Life raiſing us from the dead, we are enabled to believe whereby we make a ſenſible re-application of the Grace of Juſtification to our ſelves, and *being juſtified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* But more of this *infra.*

§. 8. The Judge of all the World muſt judge righteouſly, *i. e.* according to his righteous Law, for as that is *norma officii* to us, ſo it is of *judicii* to him; now here is the Myſtery, How God can juſtifie a ſinner according to moſt perfect law, and do it freely δωρεὰν. Mr. *H.* in his *Medio. p.* 5. hath this Quæry, *The Goſpel requires Faith, Repentance, new Obedience, how then are we juſtified and ſaved by Grace? how is it free when it is not vouchſafed but upon condition? This difficulty hath made ſome run into the Extream, that the Covenant of Grace is without conditions. Reſp.* It is ſuch an extream Argument againſt the *Neonomian* Doctrine, that all their Skill and Sophiſtry neither hath, nor can anſwer, and the Argument ſtands thus, If nothing doth eſſentially diſtinguiſh a Covenant of Works from a Covenant of Grace, but the Conditionality of it, then a Covenant of Grace muſt have no Condition, and whatever Covenant hath a Condition, is a Covenant of Works; but there's nothing can diſtinguiſh; becauſe the Antecedent is true, therefore the Conſequence. There can be nothing in ſenſe to invalidate either Propoſition, for the diſtinguiſhing formal difference between the one Covenant and the other, muſt be Condition, and no Condition, where the true Oppoſition lieth, for the promiſe of both Covenants are life, therefore the ſpecial and formal difference lieth in conditionality, & none; now to ſay, it lies in the nature of the condition, will appear moſt abſurd. 1. If it be the littleneſs of the Condition makes a Covenant of Grace; this I deny, for the promulgated Covenant of Works was laid upon the leaſt condition imaginable, the *forbearing to eat an Apple*, but let us hear what Mr. *H.* will ſay to make a Covenant of

Works

Works a Covenant of Grace, p. 5. *I ſay readily the Grace of God and of the Goſpel is free*, and therefore not conditional; well, but how, wherein is the freedom? *In that it accepts of the ſinners Faith and Repentance, when he needs not, or when according to the law he was not tied to it.* *Reſp.* Was the Man awake or aſleep when he ſaid this, he ſays its free becauſe God accepts of his Faith and Repentance, that's the ſame freedom whereby I may be ſaid to give a Man a Horſe when I accept of Money which he was to pay me for it: Is not a Covenant a Bargain? Was it not ſo to *Adam*? Was it poſſible he ſhould ſay, he need not accept it? What doth he make of his New-Law-Covenant? need not God keep it? where was God's Faithfulneſs and Truth when he made that Covenant? doth not that bind him to accept our Faith and Obedience as the Condition? *According to the law he is not tied*; Why will an honeſt Man ſpeak ſo equivocally to juſtifie a cauſe his Conſcience tells him, or ought to do, that it is nought, he ſays, *according to the law*, I pray what law? the Old or New? Doth he not ſay, that Faith and Repentance is the Condition of the New Law? and is not God bound to accept of them by that Law? Oh but he is not bound to accept of them by the old law: It is juſt as if a Man brings the Money that I ſold ſuch a Commodity for, and I tell him, I will not take the Money unleſs he will confeſs, I gave him it freely, no ſaith he, I make a tender of the Money with which I bought it, I will never ly for the Bargain, and ſay you gave it me, when I bought it, to which I reply, I am not bound by law to accept the Money. What law? the law that the King and Parliament made for the Pole-Tax. *H.* 'Unleſs Man's Obedience were perfect, but he is bound by the new 'law to accept imperfect Obedience. *H.* our Divines ſay uſu-'ally, becauſe its not of merit—— but this labours with ſome defect of light, 'if man had performed the condition of the cove-'nant of Works, it might have bin ſaid upon this reaſon that 'Life and Salvation had bin ſtill of Grace and Free, as not merit-'ed, while theſe conſiderations hinder merit. How might Man's Obedience in the Covenant of Works be ſaid to be of Free Grace? becauſe his were not proportionable to the reward; no more are good Angels works to this day, *there was Grace in making the Covenant on eaſie Terms*, but when the Covenant is made, the Reward is merited *ex pacto*, by the performed Conditions: Hence the Apoſtle's reaſoning remains unſhaked, *they that are juſtified of debt, are not of grace.*

§. 9. Mr. *Humphry* makes a fearful bungling about this buſineſs, and lends us for our help a diſtinction about merit, and faith, *There is a debt or merit of Commutative Juſtice, and of diſtributive*;

it

it is impoſſible that any ſhould engage the Almighty in the former? Reſp. But the Almighty may engage himſelf in it to the creature, may there not be place for commutative Juſtice between a ſuperiour and inferiouur? between a King and People all obligatory Covenants upon terms of mutual performances are primarily fulfilled in a way of commutative Juſtice; diſtributive Juſtice comes in for redreſs in caſe of non-performance of mutnal agreements, or upon complaint thereof. *Of the latter* [*i. e.* diſtributive Juſtice] *there is a merit or debt upon compact or ſtrict retaliation; it is true, that there is nothing Man does, or can do in the ſtate of innocency could merit upon ſtrict retaliation. Reſp.* I ſuppoſe he means by his term of *ſtrict retaliation*, rewarding juſt ſo much as the value of the work, more, *i. e.* to reward man juſt as much as the value of not eating an Apple, but the reward promiſed, was infinitely more, and it was promiſed upon ſo ſmall a Condition, therefore upon the performance of the condition, the reward, as great as it was, would have become due *ex pacto*, and hence a true debt. But he tells us what a Compact is.

§. 10. Mr. *H. A Compact may be two-fold, Upon Terms equal or unequal: Upon terms equal, we know the reward doth become debt, and may be ſaid to be merit; notwithſtanding by way of ſtrict Retaliation, or upon account of equal benefit, the performance of the condition would require no ſuch matter. Reſp.* Equality of Terms in an Agreement is, ſo much for ſo much, the mutual performance whereof is *ſtrict retaliation.* Tho the Term is foreign to the matter in hand, for it belongs to revenge in giving a man as good, or rather bad as he brings. I deny, that Compact upon Terms equal or unequal, do alter the nature thereof, ſo that the Condition is not a Merit, and the Promiſe a Reward. He ſaith, *If I agree to give a man 2 s. 6 d. for his days work, I muſt pay the debt tho the Emolument be not worth half the money.* Here he anſwers himſelf in his ſtrict retaliation, and tho the condition is worth little, yet it is the Compact that makes the Debt upon the performance. And he ſays, *If I promiſe a poor man a ſhilling for leading my Horſe to the next Stile, its Alms, an act of Grace. Reſp.* It ſeems here's but 18 d. difference between Works and Grace. An agreement to give a man 2 *s.* 6 *d.* for a Days Work makes a Debt, but an agreement to give a ſhilling for leading his Horſe, is Alms; he allowed the mans Days-work prov'd not to be worth above a ſhilling, and yet *ex pacto*, he was indebted to him 2 *s.* 6 *d.* and why I pray, Is it not as good a Debt to the poor man that he bargains with to lead his Horſe to the next Stile? he will ſay, it was not worth ſo much in ſtrict Retaliation, no more was the other man's Days-work; if he had given the man the ſhilling, and afterward

terward ſaid, prethee lead my Horſe to the next Stile, he would have ſaid, ay Maſter, and thank you too; but if he agree with him, when he hath done his work, he could demand the Wages as Debt, tho it may be he would thank him for ſo eaſie a Bargain. He tells us, *The firſt Covenant was upon Terms equal, and if man did his duty, tho with the ability God gives him (as if I agree with a man to work with my Tools) the reward is of Merit or Debt. Anſw.* If he means equal in value, I deny that the Firſt Covenant was ſo any more than the New Law covenant: Ay, but if he means equal as to obligation in a way of commutative Juſtice, *i. e.* that God is as much bound to perform his part after covenanting, as Man to perform his, then I ſay the New Covenant is as equal as the old, for each is but equality of obligation; but he goes on, *When he gives us the reward, which is eternal life thro his Son, upon obedience which is imperfect* [that is upon a new covenant upon terms unequal] *he gives it freely. R.* Here it plainly appears what he means by terms equal and unequal, that it is as to intrinſick value, that a covenant of works are terms equal (wherein alſo he contradicts himſelf) *i. e.* man's perfect obedience in the ſaid covenant is ſo much for ſo much, as good as the reward, its a days-work in it ſelf worth the Wages promiſed, whereas before he ſaith it was not; but now he ſaith, *when the wages are more worth than the work, its on terms unequal*; but the terms unequal do not change the nature of a Bargain to make it none; for there are different Bargains, ſome better, and ſome worſe; but is the new law covenant a better Bargain or worſe than that of the covenant of Works? I take it to be much the harder, becauſe of the incapacity of the Covenantee: Man in the ſtate of Perfection could much eaſier perform the condition of the covenant by perfect obedience than he can now in his lapſt ſtate perform the condition of the new law by imperfect, as may eaſily be demonſtrated from theſe mens Principles, they affirming, that *the performing the condition is not by natural power and ſtrength.*

§. 11. But Mr. *H.* returns after this excurſion in ſaying, *p. 7. That the grace of Juſtification is purchaſed by Chriſt, is apparent by Rom.* 3.24. The purchaſe of Grace (being free in the exerting its ſelf) is a contradiction; for what God doth by Grace, he doth *ſua ſponte*, without motion thereto by externals, and its meerly of his own good will and pleaſure, *I will have mercy on whom I will:* Our Divines ſay, the covenant of Grace was not purchaſed, no not by Chriſt; but the way of the execution of this covenant was in and through Chriſt and his Purchaſe; that God might not infringe his Juſtice in the leaſt in exerting his Grace to the Salvation of Sinners. This Mr. *H.* oppoſeth and ſaith, *If the Notion*

of free *did ly in the conception our Divines ordinarily frame, then could it not be the fruit of Chriſt's purchaſe; for how can that which is purchaſed in their ſenſe, be free? Reſp.* There's much more reaſon to ſay, how can that which is purchaſed in Mr. *H.*'s ſenſe be free? There's leſs reaſon that a thing purchaſed in the Original and Fountain ſhould be free, than what is purchaſed in the Streams; therefore Mr. *H*'s. Anſwer cuts off his own legs; for if the Grace of God be not free becauſe it comes to us in and through Chriſt, and as the fruits of Chriſt's Purchaſe, then when this *gratia dans* is purchaſed how can that be free? He proceeds

§ 13. *Whereas it is this Grace certainly is the main fruit of Chriſt's Redemption,* viz. *that the new Covenant ſhould be eſtabliſhed. Reſp.* Here it appears that he aſſerts, That the Grace whereby the New Covenant was made, was *purchaſed grace, therefore not free* by his own aſſertion, becauſe purchas'd, he ſays, Chriſt purchaſed the Grace of the New Covenant, therefore the covenant and all in it: So you ſee, he will have *Purchaſe* in our ſenſe, inconſiſtent with *Free Grace*; but *purchaſe* in his ſenſe more comprehenſive, to be Free Grace; but now he will have the *freeneſs* to ly in beſtowing freely the works which ſhould make the reward due to him; To which I anſwer, its one thing to juſtifie for the Works wrought, and another to give them: Mr. *H.* calls this latter, *infuſion of Grace and Sanctification*; *but Juſtification is declaring a man righteous by the ſaid Works.*: Now if this Grace giving the condition be purchaſed, then Faith and Obedience was purchaſed by Chriſt, contrary to Mr. *H.* who ſaith *it comes only as the gift of election*: Hence it appears, that he will have Grace in the root to be purchaſed as to exhibition of the whole covenant, but not as to the performance of the main part of it.

§. 13. *See then how the Grace of God is made free in the ſenſe of the Apoſtle, not upon the account that man cannot merit at God's hand, ſeeing God can be a debtor* ex pacto regimine gratiæ paterno. *Reſp.* God can be a Debtor to ſinful Man *ex pacto*, but then 1. Its upon *pactum abſolutum*, not ſuch a Covenant as makes man's works meritorious. 2. It is in and through Chriſt only that God is a Debtor in the way of Juſtice. 3. Its meerly *Free Grace* that hath brought about the Sinners Salvation by Chriſt, and not purchaſed by himſelf. 4. God is not, nor ever will be a Debtor to ſinful Man, to juſtifie him for or by any works done by him either here or hereafter. 5. Therefore whatever is the fruit of Free Grace in us, is free in reſpect of us on whom it is beſtowed; we do not merit or deſerve it in the leaſt, neither doth God reward any of his Children *regimine fœderis operum*, ſuch as the New Law is and muſt be, which rewards us upon our own fulfilling the condition, *But upon the account here*

here mentioned (before refuted) which is a most direct answer, because we have shewed the indirectness and falsity of it—— And I declare, that God's Abatement of Terms, and requiring a new Condition, is that which therefore makes it free, seeing it is tendred and obtained without performance of the old. Resp. The changing of Terms in a covenant doth not make it free, if God had changed the terms of the old covenant from perfect obedience to imperfect, it had not made it free, because *the condition is* Works still, for here the change is but a change from one compact to another, *viz.* Abatement of terms, and requiring new terms in the room. What if a man gets his Creditor, (of whom he complains he hath a hard Bargain) to make another Bargain upon easier terms, this is a favour indeed, but its justice, considering he had brought him under too hard terms before, but yet he doth not therefore give the commodity to him because he allows him easier terms, but makes another Bargain upon other terms. So here, the new law is as much a Bargain as the other, tho upon easier terms, which cannot be admitted. He proceeds to refute *Augustine*, about the works of the law, according to *Paul*'s sense, which we shall examine when we come upon that Point.

§. 14. We shall here gather the sum of what according to truth, is to be asserted and defended against Mr. *H.* and the rest.

1. That the covenant of Works was not made with Man upon equal Terms, for his perfectest Obedience could never be equal with the promised Reward.

2. That the New-law Covenant is upon as equal Terms, according to the nature of the Law, and they differ not in nature from the old covenant being works, if they differ in degree, its the covenant which hath made it so, and the Promise is as much a reward to the imperfection, as it was in the old to a perfect condition, by God's constitution.

3. God is free, and can be bound by none but himself, and its his Grace to covenant with the creature any way, but when God hath freely, without purchase, covenanted upon Terms of the creatures performance, he maketh himself a Debtor thereupon, let the Terms be perfect or imperfect.

4. In the pretended new-law covenant, where faith and obedience are the conditions, Man merits *ex pacto*, and God becomes a Debtor to him as much as he should have bin to *Adam* if he had stood, hence the Apostle cannot mean *justifying freely by grace* in Mr. *H*'s sense: But when we are said to be *justified freely by Gods grace*, is meant, 1. That it is of the pleasure of God's Will, not upon any external Motive, no not of Christ's Death, that God exerts the Grace of Justification, *he is gracious to whom he will.*

2. It is free in that the Object of it, upon whom it falleth, is a ſinner every way undone and miſerable, without Works or Qualifications, much leſs deſerving of this Grace, and this is the chief meaning of the Apoſtle in *Rom.* 3.

3. The providing, giving and beſtowing Chriſt and his righteouſneſs is an high act of Grace, that a ſinner may be juſtified at the Bar of Divine Juſtice, that a ſinner, according to the Myſtery of his Will and gracious Diſpenſation may be fully acquitted thro Chriſt from the fiery Law, and diſcharged from all the charges thereof by the higheſt Juſtice.

4. That as it was *Free Grace* every way to us, conſidered in our ſelves, therefore a Covenant of Promiſe without conditions required on our part, hence abſolute; ſo it was a higher Covenant of Works to the Second *Adam* than ever the Firſt was under, and whereas Mr. *H.* objects and ſays, *then we are juſtified by the law:* I anſwer, 1. Where did he ever ſee Juſtification but by a Law. 2. He makes his to be by the new Law, which law we deny to be *in rerum natura.* 3. As we are juſtified by the Grace of God, ſo it is in Chriſt Jeſus, and a Believer in Chriſt needs no New Law to juſtifie him, he is juſtified by the Law in Jeſus Chriſt, and yet *freely by Grace.*

CHAP. III.

Of Righteouſneſs.

Sect. 1. *Righteouſneſs what, and of what kinds.* §. 2. *Of Diſtributive Juſtice.* §. 3. *Diſtinctions in reſpect of Juſtice.* §. 4. *God's Juſtice in Efficiency.* §. 5. *No Juſtifying Righteouſneſs but perfect.* §. 6. *Of the way of God's Execution of his Juſtice.* §. 7. *Righteouſneſs again diſtinguiſhed.* §. 8. *Righteouſneſs of Juſtification and Sanctification.*

Sect. 1. JUſtitia eſt ſuum cuique tribuere, to give every one his due; ſo *Cicero.* The Spirit of God tells us, *its to render every one their due or right, Rom.* 13. 7. *Prov.* 27. And its either commutative or diſtributive; commutative when perſons mutually perform their Duty to each other which they are bound to

to by any Law, Covenant or Agreement, whether they be ſuperiors to inferiors, or inferiors to ſuperiors, or equals to one another; a due conformity in obedience to a Law, is commutative Juſtice, *Rom.* 13. done for Conſcience ſake, giving the Legiſlator his due; but if he is pleaſed not only to bind me to Duty, but promiſe a Reward upon performance, as I am bound to Obedience, ſo on the performance thereof God is bound to Reward; whence if Man had ſtood, the Covenant had bin fulfilled by way of commutation; its ſo between Magiſtrate and People, being bound together by Covenant, and each obſerving his Duty to other, its done by commutative Juſtice, and yet without any derogation from the Authority and Grandeur, and juſt Prerogative of the Magiſtrate.

§. 2. Diſtributive Juſtice or Righteouſneſs, is Magiſtratick, for the maintaining commutative Juſtice, by awarding it where its refuſed, or puniſhing the breach thereof, or in vindicating juſt perſons, which are falſly accuſed upon that account, to render to men judicially according to their works. All firſt conformity to Laws and Covenants is by commutative Juſtice; but upon complaint of the breach of the Rules thereof, Diſtributive Juſtice takes place. Hence God's execution of diſtributive Juſtice takes place upon the Fall of Men and Angels.

§. 3. Again, Righteouſneſs is to be diſtinguiſhed in regard of the ſubject, Its either the Righteouſneſs of God, or the Righteouſneſs of Man; the Righteouſneſs of God is that which peculiarly belongs to himſelf, and that in his Sufficiency or Efficiency; the Juſtice appertaining to God in his Sufficiency, is his Eſſential Attribute, whereby he is eternally, infinitely and unchangeably righteous; this is not a righteouſneſs imputed unto us in Juſtification, but a juſtifying righteouſneſs, it is the juſt God that juſtifieth.

§. 4. God's Juſtice in Efficiency is the execution thereof, that his eſſential Juſtice may ſhine forth to his Praiſe and Glory, The Execution of his Juſtice is a tranſient Act, and is either Legiſlation, or execution of his Laws. God's Legiſlation is his acting from his Sovereign Will and Pleaſure in laying what Laws he pleaſeth on the creature; Laws are not purchaſed of God, any more than Grace, therefore they that talk in that manner, ſeem neither to underſtand Law or Grace. In God's Legiſlation, he hath given Man but one Law for Life, in the fulfilling whereof or not, Man is liable to be eternally ſaved or condemned; and God never made, nor Chriſt purchaſed any Remedying Law to amend the faults thereof, never abrogated or relaxt it, but it ſtands in its full Sanction preceptive, remunerative or vindictive.

§. 5. There neither is, nor ever was any justifying righteousness to Man, but what is the perfect and compleat righteousness of this Law, as imperfect righteousness is renounced and condemned by this Law; so it will not stand for Justification with any of God's Laws, neither is it Grace in God to relax his Law, he cannot deny himself in the perfection of Justice.

§. 6. The execution of this Law upon Man since the Fall, is in a way of meer Justice, or in a way of exact Justice in consistency with Grace and Mercy. In a way of meer Justice, to the Glory thereof, on the Vessels of Wrath; in a way of Justice in consistency with all the designs of Grace and Mercy, by setting up a Second *Adam*, and providing such a righteousness in him, as might fully answer all the demands of the Law, which the Law should accept and and impute to the Sinner, the Mediatorial and Surety Righteousness of Christ, and this is called *the righteousness of God*, that we are made in Justification. Mr. *H.* denys it, but we shall endeavour to prove it.

§. 7. Righteousness of Man is to be distinguished, Either as it is of his own performance for Justification, and so its the righteousness of the Law, and rejected by the Apostle; Or as its performed by another, by Jesus Christ for us, and this is called *Our Righteousness*, and is so by real Imputation and Free Gift: *This is our only Evangelical Righteousness.*

§. 8. Its also considered in respect of Justification before God, In this respect all Fallen Man's imperfect Righteousness is filthy Rags; in respect of Sanctification they are the *fruit of the Spirit*, and accepted in Christ, the person being justified, and therefore Believers are often denominated righteous in Scripture.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of Imputation.

Sect. 1. *What Imputation imports.* §. 2. *How it differs from Juſtification.* §. 3. *Not to impute is to acquit.* §. 4. *To attribute or aſcribe, what.* §. 5. *Legal Imputation.* §. 6. *The Second Sort.* §. 7. *Imputation by Attainder.* §. 8. Neonomians *deny Imputation of* Adam's *Sin.* §. 9. *Imputation by way of Suretiſhip.* §. 10. *A Surety a Repreſentative.* §. 11. *The difference of Imputation by way of Attainder, and by way of Suretiſhip.* §. 12. Neonomians *deny Imputation of Sin to Chriſt.*

Sect. 1. IMputation for the moſt part in Scripture is a Forinſick or Law Term, as *Juſtification* is; the *Greek* Word λογίζομαι, the *Hebrew* חשב and it is the accounting things or actions to Perſons which they did not do, or plead they did not do; when a man's action comes to be *lis coram Judice*, the firſt Enquiry is *de facto*, whether he be guilty of it or not guilty? the Judgment of the Court by the Jury is the Imputation or laying Guilt upon him, or the acquitting him, which is not only non-imputation of Fault to him, but imputing righteouſneſs unto him: The Sentence of the Judge on the Verdict of Guilty, is *Condemnation*; on the Verdict of Not Guilty, is *Juſtification*. I find the word ſo uſed, 1 *Sam.* 22. 15. when *Abimelek* is accuſed by *Doeg* to *Saul*, for enquiring of the Lord concerning *David*, he ſaith, *Let not the King impute any thing unto his ſervant:* אל ישם המלך בעבדו *Let not the King lay it upon, or aſcribe it to his ſervant as a fault.* Lxx μὴ θέσθω ὁ βασιλεὺς κατὰ τοῦ δούλου αὐτοῦ λόγον, *Let not the King lay any thing to the charge of his ſervant.* This is rendred *impute* by our Tranſlators, ſo 2 *Sam.* 19. 19. *Shimei* pleading with *David* for his Pardon, ſaith, אל יחשב לי אדני עון Μὴ λογισάσθω ὁ κύριός μου ἀνομίαν, *let not my lord impute ſin to me.* Likewiſe in the Plea of a righteous action, *Lev.* 7. 18. *If the Prieſt ſhall eat the fleſh of the ſacrifice on the third day*, God ſaith, *it ſhall not be accepted, neither ſhall it be* imputed

to him that offers it; the Word is לא יחשב Lxx is ὐ λογισθήσεται αὐτῷ: So in offering any where but at the Door of the Tabernacle, *blood shall be* imputed* *to that man that doth it, Lev.* 17. 4. דם יחשב, Lxx. λογισθήσεται τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ αἷμα; now these are the words used for *imputing* in the Old Testament, and as the *Sept.* renders חשב by λογίζομαι, in the forequoted places, in the same sense the Apostles use it in the New Testament, whence it appears that *Imputation* is a Law Term, and its used when it comes to be argued in Law, whether this thing or action, whether righteousness or unrighteousness is to be ascribed to a person, whereby he stands just or unjust in the eye of the Law, and what the Judgment of the Court is, is *Imputation*. Such Trials do especially concern two things, *Right* or *Actions*, in matters of Right, or Claim, the Judgment of the Court imputes it to the Plaintiff or Defendant; in matters of Fact the Judgment of the Court determines it, or imputes it, as righteousness or unrighteousness.

* *To impute is to lay any thing to the charge*, so Minst. Lat. *Imputare aliquid alicui.* Plin. *Cædem alicui imputare.* So Quint.

§. 2. Hence 1. Imputation differs from Justification, because *its of right or fact.* Its a Judgment concerning things or actions according to law, Justification in this legal sense, or Condemnation is, of Persons according to *Imputation*. 2. Guilt is the imputation of fault to the charged person in the most proper sense, *reatus culpæ*, and the acquitting a person from Guilt when charged, is the making him righteous, by removal of unrighteousness from him, so far as the Law hath to do with him. 3. A Man is not charged by one Law, and acquitted by another, but his *imputation* is always according to that law where he was charged, and therefore his Justification or Condemnation by the same; if a Man be found guilty by one Law, he cannot be acquitted by another, tho requiring milder Terms.

§. 3. Not to impute a fault is to acquit, and of the same import as to impute righteousness, and therefore where the Spirit of God speaks of non imputation of sin, *Psalm* 32. 2. *Rom.* 4. 8. 1 *Cor.* 5. 19. it always therein asserts *imputation of righteousness*; for he that is a sinner and hath no sin imputed to him, or charged upon him by the Law, is righteous, and found so by the Law, and indeed all proper imputation is by the Law, *for Sin is not imputed where there is no law*; therefore its properly the voice of the Law that imputes Sin or Righteousness, where Actions or Claims of Right come to be questioned and tried; *what the law saith, it saith to them that are under it* for judgment and condemns

therefore

therefore all transgressors, and makes them guilty before God, *Rom.* 3.19.

§. 4. To attribute, or ascribe, are larger Terms than to impute; when any thing is imputed to a person, its attributed and ascribed, but every thing attributed or ascribed, is not said to be imputed, because its spoken of in a Law-sense, *e. gr.* we attribute Holiness, Justice, Power, &c. to God, but do not say we impute them to God; we attribute Heat to Fire, hardness to Iron, but do not say, we impute Heat to Fire, or hardness to Iron, because its naturally in them.

§. 5. Legal Imputation of Sin or Righteousness is either of that which is a Man's own, unto himself, or of that which primarily is his own and imputed unto another. The first is, when a Man bears his own Sin, or stands legally in his own righteousness; upon the first the law condemns him, upon the other it justifies him; he is upon the first Judgment of the Law, found guilty or not, to have right to the Claim that he makes, or to have no right to his Claim to the Promise in a Law-Covenant. Hence imputation of righteousness fixeth his right to the promised reward. Imputation of sin cuts off his right to the said reward, and brings him under the curse of the Law.

§. 6. The second sort of legal Imputation is of a Man's own Sin or Righteousness unto another. Its by way of translation, and its either of Sin or of Righteousness. Imputation of Sin by translation, is when the Law imputes Sin to any other than the Sinner, so that by that Imputation those others are legally made Sinners. And this Imputation is twofold by way of Attainder, or by way of Suretiship.

§. 7. Imputation by way of Attainder is, when the whole Blood is charged with, and stained by the Sin of the actual transgressor. Such was *Achan*'s Sin, such also *Adam*'s First Sin; his sin was imputed to himself and all his Posterity; he being not only a single person, but a Publick Person. 1. Naturally, containing all Mankind in him. 2. Fœderally, Because God when he covenanted with him, covenanted with a Kind; he covenanted but with individuals when he covenanted with Angels. As *Adam* was when he stood, in respect of Mankind, so he was when he fell; Hence it was that all the Kind must needs fall in him, when Angels fell, each one fell but for himself, as each stood for himself; but it was not, it could not be so with Man; *Adam* therefore was the greatest Representative in respect of the number represented by him, that ever was, and *all Mankind sinned in him*; Sin did not come upon us by Propagation only (tho a sinner can propagate none but a sinner) but by imputing *Adam*'s First Sin to all his Posterity, for

for *judgment* of imputation *came upon all to condemnation* of the whole kind; elſe *Adam*'s Firſt Sin ſhould affect us no more than any other of his ſins, and *Adam*'s ſins no more than the ſins of any other of our Progenitors; Hence *Adam*'s ſin came upon us federally, and by way of Imputation as well as by Propagation and ſeminal Deſcent; for the Privation of the Image of God by *Adam*'s Sin, which was his moral Death, was a Publick Loſs, never to be regained by any that have their ſtanding only in him. Hence every Natural Man is in him, ſtands under that firſt Privation, and therefore under that firſt Guilt; and as every Man by Nature ſtands under that Guilt, he alſo is under the condemnation, Wrath and Curſe of the Law, *Death paſſed upon all men, in that all have ſinned*; the Apoſtle ſpeaks but of *Adam*'s ſin, *Rom.* 5. 12, 16. and of death paſſing upon all by that ſin imputed by the law, as appears by the following word, *that all died in Adam*, the Apoſtle is expreſs, 1 *Cor.* 15. 22. Underſtand it of which Death you pleaſe ſpiritual or corporal that *in Adam all died*, it infers neceſſarily that *Adam* was a Publick Perſon; for we cannot be ſaid to live or dy in another's life or death, but as he is a Publick Perſon, *verſ.* 49. we are ſaid *to bear the image of the earthly, i. e.* in his Fallen State, which ſhews that his Image was of a Publick Nature to all his Poſterity, and his loſs of God's Image, a Sin imputed to the whole kind.

§. 8. I cannot ſtay to inſiſt largely on the proof of the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, but is a Point of ſo great concern, that the denial of it overthrows the Goſpel in the true ſtate thereof; I ſhall only acquaint the Reader, That the *Neonomians*, together with the *Socinians* and *Quakers*, lay this denial in the foundation of their rotten Doctrine.

Neonomian. *We were not in* Adam *as a Publick Perſon, or Repreſentative by a Covenant ſtanding, nor his ſin imputed to us further than we are guilty by a natural in-being or derivation*, Scr. G. D. p. 86, 87. 112, 113. End of Controv. 95.

See his daring confidence. *We were not in* Adam *as a publick Covenanter*, I would ask whether God covenanted with *Adam* as the comprehender of all the Kind; if he did, then *Adam* was a Publick Covenantee inſtead of the whole Kind; and it appears in that the Covenant reached *Eve* then in him, when the covenant was made, *Gen.* 2. and if the covenant was made with her in him, then why not, by the ſame reaſon, with all Mankind in him? He ſaith *Adam's ſin is imputed no further than we are guilty*; we ſay, *we are not guilty any further than his ſin is imputed*; its imputation of Sin makes us guilty, not guilt that makes imputation: He ſaith alſo, *no further than by a natural in-being*; what then, doth not a natural

natural in-being in *Adam* at the time of his Covenant, make him a publick Covenanter, when the whole Nature was in him? and ſo we were federally in him, becauſe naturally; but ſee how the *Socinians* concur, Socin. *They are greatly deceived who gather that all the poſterity of* Adam *ſinned in* Adam *the Parent, and truly to have deſerved the puniſhment of death—— for ſins and merits, ſuch as are meerly perſonal, go not out of the perſon which hath ſinned, neither do Parents repreſent their Children. Altho there may be ſome hurt, and that not a little, to Children by their Parents ſin, as indeed it fell out in* Adam's *ſin; but the very Sin and Merit of* Adam *was not communicated in, nor imputed to* Adam's *Poſterity, and hence the Poſterity of* Adam *was not truly puniſhed for* Adam's *ſin, unleſs they imitated their Parents, Schlicting on Heb.* 7. 10. Whereas it appears plainly, by *Rom.* 5.12. that the merit paſſed upon all by *Adam's* ſin, *for death paſſed upon all* and the merit of Death cannot be without imputation of ſin, and it paſſed upon all that have not ſinned actually, even Infants, before they are capable of imitation of their Parents. Quakers, *We do not aſcribe any whit of* Adam's *guilt to men, till they make it theirs by the like acts of diſobedience.* Barchl. This is alſo *Pelagian* Doctrine, *That* Adam's *ſin is not imputed to his Poſterity.*

§. 9. Imputation is alſo by way of Suretiſhip, and it is when the Sins or Debts of one perſon, are by law charged upon, or imputed to another in order to the Salvation of the Principal or perſonal tranſgreſſor. Here it is always underſtood that the payment of a Surety is as good and acceptable to the Law as that of the Principal. 2. That the Surety cannot become Pay-maſter in Law, unleſs he take the Debt or Sin upon him inſtead of the proper tranſgreſſor he muſt be charged as tranſgreſſor, elſe the Law can make no demand upon him. 3. He muſt freely offer himſelf to be a Surety, no perſon can be forced in any caſe to be Surety for another. 4. When he hath engaged himſelf in Suretiſhip, the law takes him perſon for perſon, the principal Debt becomes his, and his righteouſneſs and payment becomes the Principals in a real legal commutation, here is no natural or moral Change, but ſponſorial and legal, nay, no logical change, *i. e.* one relation is not changed into another, the Surety into the Principal, nor Principal into the Surety; but in the Judgment of the Law the Principal Debt becomes the Surety's, and the Surety's Payment is the Principals, whereupon the Principal in reſpect of that Sin or Debt for which Satisfaction is made, hath the diſcharge in full, and is as perfectly righteous as to that, as the Surety himſelf; he is not it may be ſo rich and honourable as his Surety, but in reſpect of the Debt ſatisfied, the

Law

Law hath no more to say to him than to the Surety, An *Alderman* fetcheth a Prisoner, and with him many more out of *Ludgate*, owing Five or Ten Pounds a piece, this little money being all that's owing in the World by the poor Man, when discharged the Law hath no more to say to him than to the *Alderman*, and he is as righteous in the eye of the Law, tho he will not pretend to be so great and so rich, or a ransomer of others out of Prison, as the Alderman himself is.

§. 10. He that bears the sins of others must be a Representative and Publick Person, that must personate or bear the persons of them whose sins he bears, and must be either substituted by the Court, or if by some other, he must be allowed to be capable and able to make Payment, must be accepted and dealt with in the name and upon the account of the other, and becomes a Debtor or Transgressor in and for the person he doth represent in Court, and becomes a Delinquent in the eye of the Law, the Law imputing sin to him makes him sin, because he is supposed to owe nothing on his own account; he that doth *in foro* represent one or more, and stands not, nor acts for himself, but others, is a publick Person and Representative, as a Burgess or Citizen in Parliament, and they that he represents are said to act in and by him. Its a contradiction to common sense and reason, to say, that he that stands legally or civilly in the place of another, to act his part, and in his name, should not be a publick Person, but men will throw down common sense and reason to establish their own fond Conceits and Errors.

§. 11. The difference between Imputation by way of Attainder, and by way of Suretiship is, that this Imputation is in order to the Salvation of the Sinner, but that is as to legal single effects only to the Sinners Destruction. 2. That in this Imputation in the way of Suretiship, as there is Imputation of the sinners sin to the Surety, so there is a re-imputation of the Surety's righteousness to the sinner, but in Imputation of Sin by way of Attainder, there's no re-imputation of righteousness to the first sinner. 3. The Imputation doth differ in the manner of transaction. In Imputation of sin by way of Attainder, sin is transferred from the Representative to the Represented; but in Imputation by way of Suretiship, sin is transferred from the Represented to the Representative, and that's the reason, that tho we are fitly said to sin in *Adam* because he was our Representative; yet its not so fitly said that Christ sinned in us, because that we were never Representatives to Christ; but its fitly said, we are righteous in Christ, because he is our Representative, and that we satisfied in Christ, which saying doth not rob Christ of his Glory

of

of Satisfaction, but gives it him, affirming that Christ satisfied, and for us, and that God is well pleased with us through him; If a man that hath owed Money to *A*, and paid him by his Surety *B*. be charged that he owes *A*. so much Money; he denys it, and saith, I paid you by *B*, doth he speak true or false? doth he not speak properly? doth he hereby say, I paid you by my own Money? No, he only saith, that *B*. paid for me my Debt with his Money: But we see how *Neonomians* will pick quarrel with common sense and reason, as they do in their denial of this high and fundamental Point *Of Imputation of Sin to Christ*, and charge it for an Error to say, *we satisfied in Christ*.

§. 12. *Neonom. Christ neither was a Sinner, nor reputed a Sinner by God.* R. B. End of Contr. p. 122. *Christ took not* reatum facti, *nor* reatum culpæ [as if there were any difference between them] *He took* reatum pœnæ, *the guilt of punishment* [that's always in the fault, for nothing deserves punishment but faults] *Scr. G. d. p.* 89. *They dangerously affirm* [meaning those he calls *Antinomians*] *that Christ took not only the punishment of our Sins, and that guilt and* reatum pœnæ, *which is an assumed obligation to suffer the punishment deserved by us, but all our very sins themselves, the very essence of the sins of all the elect* [a slander, and imposed expression that none ever said] *the* reatum culpæ, *or guilt of fault and so he bore the sins of all the Elect by real imputation* [this is truth, which Mr. *B*. chargeth as one of his hundred *Antinomian* Errors, *Er.* 18. *p.* 10. *Again being made sin for us, is meant a sacrifice for sin* [so Mr H.] *and used as a sinner* [why should he be used as a sinner, if sin was not charged upon him? sure very unjustly] *If God imputed sin to Christ, or accounted Christ a sinner, he must be by sin hateful to God,* &c. *and Christ suffered for his own sins,* &c. *Scr. G. d. p.* 30, 31. If Christ had bin a sinner, in his individual person, these consequences might have held, but Christ being by Law-imputation made sin in order to the Salvation of Sinners, its otherwise, *therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life for my sheep.* Is a rich person and honourable, hated in the Court, and detested, because he enters himself Debtor for some *Ludgate* Prisoners?

Socin. *The meaning of these words,* 2 Cor. 5. 21. *is not that he was made sin for us by God's imputation, but that he was made a sacrifice for sin, the word made is a word of Election and Ordination, Pinct. Dial.* to which Mr. *Norton* answers thus, *He was made sin for us as we are made righteousness,* i. e. *by judicial imputation, without the violation, yea with establishing of Justice, as he was made curse,* Gal. 3. 13. *because he was the sin-offering in truth, therefore he was made sin by real imputation. Nort.* against *Pinch.*

Quak.

Quak. *We deserved those things that Christ endured, and much more for our sins, but that God ever reputed him a sinner is denied, neither did he ever dy that we should be reputed righteous; by his being made sin for us must be understood his suffering for our sins, that we might be made partakers of the grace purchased by him, by the working whereof we are made the righteousness of God in him.* Barch. Apol. of Just. p. 376. Thus you see how Sifter Sects run hand in hand together.

Thus far of Imputation here, which should have bin continued to imputation of Righteousness, The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness being the main Point which the *Neonomians* oppose; but because it will be the main subject of our ensuing Discourse, we pass it over in this Chapter.

CHAP. V.

Of Imputation of Righteousness unto the Justification of a Sinner.

Sect. 1. *Righteousness imputed, and what?* §. 2. *Cardinal* Bellarmine *a Middle-way-man, and so* Quakers *too, and* Socinians. §. 3. *How consonant* Neonomians *are to that Fraternity.* §. 4. *They make inherent Holiness to be our Righteousness.* §. 5. *Why pardoned after justified, and of subordinate righteousness.* §. 6. *Of Legal and Evangelical Guilt.* §. 7. *Of Mr.* Cl's *definition of Justification, and of incompleat Justification in this life.*

Sect. 1. THat *Righteousness is imputed to the Justification of a sinner before God*, is held on all sides; but the great Controversie lies here, What Righteousness is it? Is it our own inherent righteousness, or the righteousness of another? the *Neonomians* with the *Papists* say, its our own which is the formal cause of our Justification; we say, that Christ's Righteousness is the material cause of our Justification, and Imputation the formal. Mr. *H.* excludes the Merits of Christ from any of the essential causes, and makes it only *modum efficientis*, something in the hand of the efficient, it may be an instrument, but at the best it

its but *causa ministrans*, by way of efficiency, but enters not that effect as any essentiai Cause. Mr. *H.* would find out some little Difference between the *Papists* and himself, but its so little that he can hardly render it visible. The Counsel of *Trent* saith thus, *There is only one formal Cause of Justification which is the Righteousness of God, not whereby he is Righteous, but whereby he makes us Righteous*; viz. *which he hath bestowed on us, whereby we are renewed in the Spirit of our minds, and are not only reputed Just, but are truly called Righteous and are so* — and it follows, *In this is the Justification of the Ungodly, whilst for the Merit of that most Holy Passion, the Love of God is shed abroad by the Holy Ghost in the Hearts of them that are justified, and inherent in them, whence in Justification it self with Remission of Sins this is together with it infused*, &c. *Sess. 6. c. 7.*

Mr. *H.* agrees with them, that our inherent Righteousness is the formal Cause, and that it is for the Merits of Christ, that this Righteousness is wrought in us, that therefore it's called the Righteousness of God. *Bellarmine* in Defence of the Doctrine of the *C. of Tr.* says, the State of this whole Controversie may be reduced to this one Question. *Whether or no the formal Cause of Absolute Justification be Righteousness inhering in us?* Which he endeavours to maintain in the Affirmative. Mr. *H.* would have some difference from the *Papists* in that they say Justification is by Infusion of Righteousness, whereas he saith Infusion of Grace is Sanctification, but Justification is by Grace infused; of the two, I take the *Papist* to be rightest in constitutive Justification, and to have less of Merit in it; whereas Mr. *H.* Justification is by Sanctification wrought first, which carries more of Merit and less of Grace, for here Justification appears at first sight to be *ex condigno* the good qualification of the Subject. Yea the Papists go further then Mr. *H.* for he will not have Imputation of Christs Righteousness nor Remission of Sins to have any place in Justification, which the *Papists* own to be Parts of our Justification, for the Council of *Trent* do Anathametize those only that teach, that a Man is justified only by Imputation of Christs Righteousness and Remission of Sins, without inherent Grace and Charity; yea I do not find that this *Neonomian* Doctrine comes any whit short of the *Popish* Doctrine of Justification, nay it out-does it in daring Contradiction to the the Gospel.

§. 2. See what a Middle-way Man the Cardinal is if he go far enough. He gives his Sense of *Rom.* 3. 24. *Justified freely*, i. e. *from his mere liberality as to our Merits, for we cannot deserve to be justified by any Work of ours, and this Bounty of God is the efficient Cause, but we are justified by his Grace*, i. e. *by a Righteousness given and infused by him* [is not this Mr. *H.* exactly, what doth he

trifle

triſle for about Infuſion] *and this is the formal Cauſe, we are juſtified alſo by the Redemption of Chriſt, and this is the meritorious Cauſe, Laſtly, we are juſtified by Faith in the Blood of a Propitiator, and this the diſpoſing Cauſe*; from hence we may learn that every ſincere *Neonomian* is a *Papiſt* in the Point of Juſtification, and that the *Popiſh* Doctrine of Juſtification is the Middle-way between the *Calviniſts* and *Arminians*. See but a Taſte, how the *Quakers* and *Socinian* fall in with this Doctrine of Juſtification by Works. *Quakers, Works and Faith are equally required to Juſtifie, Works of the Law are excluded as done by us, to be juſtified by Grace is to be juſtified by Regeneration, which cannot exclude Works wrought by Grace, ſince the Law gives not Power to obey and ſo fall ſhort of Juſtification, there's Power under the Goſpel whereby the Law comes to be fulfilled inwardly, Works through the Power of the Spirit is a Condition upon which Life is propoſed under the New Covenant. It appears from divers Scriptures, that the Apoſtle excludes only our own Righteouſneſs, as being the Righteouſneſs of the Law from being neceſſary to Juſtification*, Barcl. *Socinian, There was never but one way of Juſtification by Faith* ——*This Faith is nothing elſe but under the hope of Eternal Life to obey the Commands of Chriſt, and this we apprehend to be underſtood in Scripture where-ever we read of Salvation promiſed to them that believe in Chriſt.* Socin. de offic. Chr. Them. 42. 43. *To believe in Chriſt is nothing elſe than to obey God, according to the Rule and Preſcription of Criſt, and in doing it to expect of Chriſt a Crown of Eternal Life*, Socin. de Servatori. *To the attaining Eternal Life not any Merits are required, but the obeying Chriſts Precepts, to which Eternal Life is the conſtituted Price, or Reward; not that Obedience it ſelf deſerved it, but becauſe it hath pleaſed the moſt gracious God to deal ſo with Mankind.* Socin. Reſpon. *ad Obj. cut.*

§. 3. Now let us ſee how Conſonant our *Neonomians* be to this Fraternity in the Doctrine, we'll take it from Mr. *H.* one of the honeſteſt of the Pack and freeſt from Juggling. *Medeocr.* p. 16, 17. *Our Works do not Merit, becauſe they are not perfect* [i. e. *therefore do not Merit as related to the Old-Covenant, but Merit notwithſtanding,* ex pacto *in relation to the New-law-Covenant*] *but we are juſtified by Works as we are by Faith, becauſe Faith juſtifies only as productive of Works* [thence you ſee he placeth the Righteouſneſs of Faith in it ſelf as a Work done, and that it juſtifies only ſo, and hath no more juſtifying Nature or End then the Fruits thereof] —— *It is Faith as productive of Works, that receive the Reward of perfect Righteouſneſs* [*in that this imperfect ſtands in the Room of perfect*] *but we are ſtill to remember for Chriſts ſake.* [Bellarmine *remembred that and the Council of* Trent] *God judgeth and will judge all Men according to the Goſpel, thoſe who perform the Condition of it, he*

he accounts and pronounceth righteous; thoſe whom he accounts righteous are juſtified; I will add that the righteouſneſs of Chriſt which is the meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification, and always comes under the efficient, cannot by the ſame reaſon be the formal and material cauſe of it: It is not infuſion of righteouſneſs with the Papiſt *which is our Sanctification, nor the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs with the* Proteſtant, *which is not to be underſtood* in genere cauſæ efficiente, *nor Remiſſion of Sin with* Proteſtant *and* Papiſt [you ſee here how far he goes beyond the *Papiſt*] *but to impute to a perſon his performance of the New Covenant for Righteouſneſs, or pronouncing him righteous according to that Covenant, is the formal cauſe of his Juſtification. Med. p.* 46. Here is to be remarkt that Mr. *H.* doth peremptorily exclude from our Juſtification the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and Remiſſion of Sins, and places the whole of it in imputation of our own works for righteouſneſs, as active obedience.

§. 4. Theſe Men do as the *Papiſts* and the reſt, make our inherent Holineſs in Sanctification, to be that very righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified. Take Mr. *Cl*'s words wherein he fully expreſſeth Mr. *H*'s ſenſe in differing from the *Papiſt* about Infuſion, *Herein lieth the true difference between Juſtification and Sanctification: In Sanctification we are made holy, righteous and good, by the infuſion of thoſe Graces into us; but in Juſtification we are only accounted and declared ſuch; in the one the change is but relative, and in the other real.* Come in *Quakers*, and ſhake this Friend by the hand as one of you, you have quarrelled with the Pulpits a great while, and now you may aſcend them your ſelves when you pleaſe, and be not ſo angry at them, for you ſhall not hear theſe men call your Doctrine *Popiſh* any more; but you'll hear them call all men that are not of your Opinion *Antinomians* briſkly: See now the depth of this diſtinction, *Juſtification is not by infuſion of Sanctification, but yet Juſtification is by Sanctification infuſed.* Is it not much more rational to ſay, that Juſtification is by making a man righteous that was not ſo before; for Juſtification of a ſinner muſt be ſuch: Beſides, *is it not much more Evangelical as to juſtifying the ungodly?* as *Bellarmine* ſaith. But theſe Men ſay, *We are firſt made righteous* [that is godly] *and then pardoned* [he ſhould have ſaid *juſtified*, for his Juſtification comes in between his ſanctifying Righteouſneſs and Pardon] *and not on the contrary, firſt pardoned, and then righteous*, Mr. *C. p.* 19.

Reſp. Were ever ſuch Abſurdities aſſerted by Men of Reaſon?

1. We are firſt made righteous, and *quatenus* made ſo, are ſanctified and not juſtified; therefore Juſtification makes no man righteous, but finds them ſo; but it declares Men, what? what it

finds them, *i. e.* ſanctified. Hence to declare a Man ſanctified is his Juſtification: and I pray now, how comes in Mr. *H*'s. *cauſa formalis*? how doth Juſtification differ formally (*nam ad formam pertinet proprium & differentia*) from Sanctification, when Imputation, or God's accounting a man holy and ſanctified is his Juſtification? Is not God's Judgment according to Truth? Is it not certain that God accounts every thing to be as it is, a holy man holy? If this be all your Juſtification, its no more than as God juſtified at the Creation, he ſaw *that every thing was good.*

2. If we are firſt made righteous, and then juſtified becauſe we are ſo, its *meritum ex condigno*, whereon we are juſtified, all the World cannot hinder it.

3. *Firſt righteous, and then pardoned*; What ſenſe is in that? for a righteous perſon needs no Pardon in that thing wherein he is righteous; for therein to be righteous and want Pardon, is to ſpeak Daggers, and the abſurdeſt contradiction in the World.

§. 5. Well, But why muſt our *Neonomians* be pardoned when righteous and juſtified before? becauſe indeed their Righteouſneſs and Juſtification by it is not worth a Fig by their own confeſſion; for Mr. *Cl.* ſaith, ——*for ſince ſubordinate Goſpel Righteouſneſs is an imperfect righteouſneſs, conſiſtent with manifold failings and infirmities, therefore notwithſtanding that, there's need of pardon, and that continually:* This is alſo Mr. *H*'s Doctrine, therefore I need not tranſcribe his very words which are to this purpoſe in many places. *Reſp.* I find they are not fully agreed about the intervening Righteouſneſs between Chriſt and us, what to call it. Mr. *Cl.* calls it ſubordinate, and ſo doth Mr. *B.* but Mr. *H.* liking not that Name ſo well, had rather call it co-ordinate; but I know not from the Notion of the thing duly conſidered, why they may not go one ſtep further, and call it the Principal or ſupream juſtifying righteouſneſs, for that which hath the principal place in any thing aſcribed to it, is the principal, but our own righteouſneſs hath the principal place in the thing aſcribed to it, which is Juſtification, therefore its the chief and ſupream righteouſneſs: For they ſay we are juſtified by the imputation of this righteouſneſs only, and by no other, therefore all conducing righteouſneſſes to the introducing this, are ſubordinate to it. Again, That which hath its place only in the external cauſes, and in the modality of their operation as to the production of the effect, is much inferiour to the eſſential cauſes that enter the very effect, and are conſtitutive to it, but Chriſt's Righteouſneſs by theſe men is no more, and therefore muſt be a ſubordinate righteouſneſs to ours; ours being *cauſa formalis juſtificationis*, an eſſential cauſe, Chriſt's being

being but *causa protarch.* a remote cause, adjuvant to the efficient, therefore the righteousness of Christ can have no more than a remote causality in purchasing the New Law, by the righteousness whereof we are justified, which is no better indeed than *causa sine qua non*, its *in ordine ad* the justifying righteousness, therefore subordinate to it. 2. He saith, *This subordinate Gospel Righteousness is an imperfect righteousness.* Truly I am sorry for it, that Gospel Righteousness should be imperfect; I doubt there's little dependance upon it, since the righteousness of the law that condemns us is perfect, its little likelihood that an imperfect righteousness should save us from it; ay, but they will say, its Christ's perfect righteousness must save us from the perfect righteousness of the law condemning us. Say you so? and therefore why should not this righteousness of Christ have the honour of justifying us? it seems we are saved by Christ's righteousness, and justified by our own, as if Justification were not Salvation: But is our Gospel-righteousness imperfect? this is no Gospel, for its ill News; I must tell these men its a rotten foundation they build upon, and their Building will drop not being built on Christ, *the Corner Stone* in Justification. 3. He saith, *Its imperfect, consistent with many failings and infirmities. Resp.* I pray how comes this to pass? is it from the Legislator that constituted such a Law, whose condition is obedience consistent with sin; or is it from the Operator or Worker under this Law? if from the former, then the Law makes it in fault, if there be any; but if he hath made a law with such condition of obedience consistent with sin, then performance of such is no sin, nor needs a Pardon, *for sin is the transgression of the law* the subject is under: Now if Believers are under the New Law for Justification, and perform there what's required, what need have they of a Pardon from a righteousness borrowed from another law? If it be from the last, *viz.* the fault and defect of the operator of righteousness, that his righteousness is not the performance of the condition of the New Law, as required, then this New Law cannot justifie him, our *Neonomians*, in this Point, will be on *Scilla* or *Charybdis* in spite of the World. In a word, 1. That righteousness that cannot justifie us at the Bar of the old Law, or Covenant of Works, is no justifying righteousness, but none of our own righteousness, New Law or other, will not justifie us at the Bar of the Covenant of Works by the *Neonomians* own confession, therefore we cannot be justified by any such righteousness. 2. Again, that righteousness which needs pardon is no justifying righteousness, but is condemned by the law, for whatever is pardoned is condemned by the law first, neither is that person justified, who by the law is unpar-

doned, Pardon being an eſſential part of Juſtification in Mens Courts, where many Indictments ly againſt a Man, if he be quitted of ſome, and not of all, he is not diſcharged as juſtified; but here its worſe, I do not find that at the New Law Bar a man (as they ſay) juſtified, is quite diſcharged from any Indictment at all, for there's none fully pardoned; wherefore our *Neonomians* ſay that their Juſtification is not perfect in this life. So Mr. *Cl. Our Juſtification in this world is not perfect and compleat*, &c. p. 18.

§. 6. Mr. *Cl.* ſaith, *There's a twofold guilt, Legal and Evangelical, Legal Guilt is an obligation to eternal puniſhment; this is fully* pardoned in Juſtification, *and can never return again, becauſe Chriſt hath taken it all upon himſelf, and made full ſatisfaction to his Father's Juſtice for it, but Goſpel-guilt which is* an obligation to Goſpel-Puniſhment, *i. e. fatherly chaſtiſements for ſins after Juſtification, returns upon commiſſion of new ſins, and is removed upon repentance, ſometimes wholly, ſometimes in part.* This is alſo Mr. *H*'s Doctrine.

Reſp. The diſtinction is naught, for we deny any Evangelical Guilt, Evangelical Guilt, Threat or Puniſhment is a Bull, a downright Contradiction, if we know what Goſpel is, and they that will be ignorant, and call this Aſſertion *Antinomian* Poyſon, let them be ignorant ſtill, I thank God for the knowledge of the Goſpel ſo far, as that it is quite contrary to Guilt, Threat and Puniſhment, or Obligation to it in the true legal ſenſe thereof: Likewiſe he ſhould have diſtinguiſhed of Guilt as uſual, *reatus culpæ*, and *reatus pœnæ*, the firſt properly Guilt, and that in *judicio legis, vel judicio conſcientiæ*, if a Man be *ſub reatu culpæ judicio legis*, as they ſay the juſtified ones are, he is unjuſtified, for the law cannot juſtifie a man and declare him guilty, *i. e.* not guilty and guilty at the ſame time. Obligation to Puniſhment is not Guilt in the true ſenſe of it; for we ſay a man caſt in Court is guilty of the charged Fault, and therefore the Law binds him over to Puniſhment. We never ſay a Man is *guilty* of the puniſhment but *deſerves*, he is found guilty, and therefore the Sentence of the Law binds him to Puniſhment; but he ſaith, *Legal Guilt is fully pardoned in Juſtification*: Pardon is always of a fault, and includes not *punire*: but is ſin pardoned fully in Juſtification as to an obligation to eternal puniſhment, then 1. Pardon is included in Juſtification, contrary to what he aſſerts in the foregoing Page. 2. Juſtification is perfect and compleat, ſo far as the taking off eternal puniſhment. 3. He cannot but own this to be the main part of Juſtification at leaſt, and this it ſeems is owing to the full ſatisfaction made by Chriſt to the Juſtice of God, our righteouſneſs of the New Law hath nothing to do here in the matter of Eternal State: Where are we now? what a Juſtification is this

by

by the New Law, wherein our eternal ſtate is not concerned. Well! but our Juſtification in this life is not yet perfect; not by Chriſt becauſe he takes off only eternal puniſhment, but temporal he hath left to us to remove by Repentance, performing the righteouſneſs of the New Law, I hope this righteouſneſs falling in to help Chriſt's, it will produce perfect Juſtification. No it wont, this righteouſneſs takes away our Sins and Puniſhment wholly but ſometimes. and ſometimes only in part, and what's the reaſon? where's the fault? why it falls upon this New Law, which is always fulfilling and never fulfilled; it will never juſtifie any one till the laſt day, and it cannot do it then without the perfect righteouſneſs of the Old Law.

§. 7. Let's take Mr. *Cl*'s Definition of Juſtification into conſideration a little, He ſaith, *The Definition of Juſtification ſo far as it relates to God is thus, Juſtification is an act of God whereby he accounts us righteous at preſent, and treats us as ſuch, and will ſolemnly declare and pronounce us ſo at the laſt day of Judgment.*

Reſp. He ſhould have told us what act of God, whether immanent or tranſient, whether an act of Grace or Juſtice, or both, he ſhould have told us the object of that act, whether a meer ſinner or a righteous perſon? he will tell us anon, its a righteous perſon, and he ſaith, *accounting him ſo at preſent*, if this *accounting him* be in a law ſenſe, its but Imputation at moſt, and this is that, and all that he doth at preſent, he finds them holy and righteous, and judgeth them to be as they be; but doth not God declare them righteous at preſent, neither *in foro Legis*, nor *in foro Evangelii*, nor *in foro conſcientiæ*? in none of theſe at preſent, when then? the very Sentence of Juſtification is not till the laſt day; ſo that indeed there is none juſtified till then; for a ſuſpended ſentence keeps the perſon (whatever Opinion the Judge hath of him) under the Law, in Priſon, and in continual fear of Condemnation; ſo that they are all the day long for fear of Death ſubject to Bondage.

§. 8. Hence he infers two things. 1. *That Juſtification while we are in this life is but partial, imperfect and incompleat, and that we ſhall not obtain fully compleat, entire and final Juſtification for all the effects of ſin till the Day of Judgment.* To which I anſwer, Where there is but an imperfect, partial Juſtification there muſt be a partial Condemnation; it cannot be denied but the Apoſtle denys it, and ſaith, *there's no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Jeſus.*

2. The law knows no ſuch thing, a man is either perfectly juſtified for the ſame thing, or perfectly condemned, there's no Medium betwixt Juſtification and Condemnation.

3. If the New Law do not perfectly justifie a person, then it condemns too at the same time, that when ever the Parator of righteousness takes himself to be justified, he is bound to believe himself condemned also; and whether will stand good at the last Day he knows not, either his Justification or Condemnation.

CHAP. VI.

Of Pardon.

Section 1. *Whether Remission of Sin belongs to Justification.* §. 2. *Remission distinguished by Mr.* H. §. 3. *Of general Remission.* §. 4. *Conditional Pardon antecedent to a mans Justification.* §. 5. *Actual Pardon subsequent to a mans Justification.*

Sect. 1. MR. *C*'s Second Inference is, *That Justification doth not properly consist in Pardon*; afterward he saith, *a man is first righteous and then pardoned*; to which we have spoken something. Mr. *H.* makes a fearful pudder about this Point, we will a little inspect his Notions, *Mediocr.* p. 44, 55. *Our Divines do generally place Justification in remission of Sins, and so do the* Papists, *and so did I my self. Resp.* Remission of Sins is upon good grounds placed in Justification as an essential part of the Justification of a Sinner, and I can boldly deny that sinner to be justified, whose sins are not forgiven, and to separate them is as possible as to separate *homo & animal rationale.* The Law, any Law, nay your New Law cannot justifie a sinner and declare him righteous, unless in that very act of declaring him righteous his sins are taken away *in foro legis*, and this is God's Remission (tho not Man's) for *his ways are not as mans*; and whereas Mr. *H.* makes remission of sins to be a benefit after Justification as an effect of it, we say it is a benefit in Justification, and the first thing in it in Nature; for its impossible any one should stand righteous in the eye of any Law, that stands chargeable as a transgressor thereof. *But remission must not* (saith Mr. *H.*) *be the formal reason of Justification. Resp.* The form of an Act, and the formal reason of that Act are two things, the material reason of Justification is righteousness, and the formal cause is imputation of that righteousness, Justification comes in as the acquitting Sentence, opposed

ed (as Mr. *B.* ſaith) *to condemnation, which* ex natura rei, *muſt formally carry in it forgiveneſs of ſins.* He proceeds, *To forgive a mans ſins and declare him rigeteous are two inconſiſtencies one with another in the ſame reſpect. Reſp. Cujus contrarium verum*; in Juſtification of a Sinner they are moſt conſiſtent, and inſeparable, that in declaring a ſinful man righteous his ſins are alſo done away; its true, in mans way of Pardon there is ſome inconſiſtency, becauſe his is by diſpenſing with his Law, but God's way of forgiveneſs is in and through the ſatisfaction of his Law; but I muſt tell him, that here no Man is looked upon as righteous in the eye of man's law that hath tranſgreſſed it, till he is firſt pardoned, ——*and therefore when God pronounceth a man juſt, it is according to the law of faith, when he pardons his ſins it is in reſpect of the law of works. Reſp.* Here are two Bars, now he ſaith elſewhere, *he likes not two bars,* I would fain know now at which of theſe Bars a ſinner is moſt juſtified, either by the law of Works, where all his ſins are forgiven, and therefore conſequently muſt be made righteous; or at the Bar of the New Law where he ſaith, *the man is declared juſt, but imperfectly ſo,* and therefore goes away with his ſins upon his Back to the Law of Works to have them pardoned: Is it not pretty Divinity then, to ſay a man is declared righteous firſt at the Bar of the Law of Faith, and then all the Bed-role of his ſins are pardoned at the Bar of the Law of Works?

§. 2. He comes to diſtinguiſh of Remiſſion, *Its either conditional and univerſal, as it lies in the Covenant, and is the purchaſe of Chriſt, or actual, as it lies in application thereof to particular perſons upon performance of the conditions. Reſp.* This Diſtinction is a great Point among the *Neonomians*, Mr. *B.* makes much uſe of it in his *Univerſal Redemption*, the Story is this, They feign that God finding the inconvenience of the law of works, by reaſon of the Fall, his Son ſatisfied not the law broken, but compounded with God as Lord above Law, that this law ſhould be relapſed; ſaith Mr. *H.* Mr. *B.* ſaith *that it might be abrogated*, which is more rational, tho it is more downright *Antinomianiſm*, which ſcares Mr. *H.* Chriſt accordingly dies to purchaſe a New Law, with condition of imperfect obedience inſtead of the perfect, the propounding or promulgating this New Law to all the world is *univerſal remiſſion*, it being the offer of Remiſſion on the condition of imperfect obedience to all the World; in this ſence all the world, they ſay, is redeemed, juſtified and forgiven before they perform that condition. Now, if any others, beſides *Neonomians* ſhould talk at this rate, they would be in danger of being taken up and ſent to *Bethlem* for Madmen. As if a Company, ſuppoſe the *E. India*, ſet up their Bills for a Sale at a certain time after prefixt, with the re-

ſpective Prizes; if one or all ſhould run about the City before the day of Sale prefixt, and ſay, they had ſold their Goods at ſuch and ſuch Prizes, all men will call them Liars or Madmen. So, becauſe God proffers eternal life upon performance of a condition, therefore all men are redeemed, juſtified and forgiven, *i. e.* ſay they, *conditionally*, and that's not at all till they perform the condition; but *Neonomians* may talk non-ſence, and contradict by the New Law, yea and aſſert Juſtification before Faith, while they call others *Antinomians* who do it, when they are the greateſt *Antinomians* themſelves in the World. Now the noiſe that they make about the Merit and Purchaſe of Chriſt, its no more than his purchaſing the New Law of Works, and they are juſtified by the performing the condition of the new law for the ſake of Chriſt's Merits, its only becauſe, as Mr. *H.* tells us, *that Chriſt by his Merits was an efficient of the New Law*; ſo that generally, in all they talk of Chriſt's Satisfaction and Merits, there's ſome cheat or Amphibology. Mr. *H.* indeed ſpeaks out moſt honeſtly, in as good as telling us, that *Neonomians* are *Papiſts* in the Point of Juſtification. But to proceed,

§. 3. *When Divines ſay we can do nothing our ſelves for procuring reconciliation and remiſſion, it is to be underſtood of conditional, univerſal remiſſion. Reſp.* What Divines underſtand ſo? they are not the *Proteſtants*, its only the *Neonomians* who are no *Proteſtants* in the Point of Juſtification: Theſe Divines underſtand only, that we cannot purchaſe the conditional, univerſal Remiſſion, the Purchaſe of that it ſeems was peculiar to Chriſt; but as for particular Remiſſion, theſe men purchaſe, and Reconciliation too; Chriſt purchaſed that we might purchaſe, and tho he purchaſed the new law, and promulgation of it, yet he purchaſed not the performance of the Condition; for ſuch hard terms they will keep Chriſt too that he may not entrench on their Dignity.

§. 4. *Conditional Pardon is antecedent to a mans Juſtification, and contained in our redemption, in whom we have redemption through his blood the forgiveneſs of ſins. Reſp.* Conditional Pardon is none, its no more than the offer of a Bargain to any that will come to the Terms: As if I ſhould offer to Lett my Houſe for ſo much Money by a Bill over the Door, and then ſay, I have Lett my Houſe to all the men in *London*. And its ſtrange, that all men ſhould be pardoned and redeemed and not juſtified, but I think *R. B.* ſaith *they are juſtified*, and I am ſure they may be as well juſtified as pardoned. However he owns Pardon in Redemption, and this antecedent to Faith; ſure then Juſtification (which with us) is inſeparable from Faith, is not *Antinomianiſm*. And is it poſſible any Divine ſhould abuſe the Scripture ſo, as to

wreſt

wreſt it to ſuch a ſenſe, that the Apoſtle ſhould by Remiſſion there, mean ſuch as is contained in univerſal Redemption, *Col.* 1. 14. whereas the Apoſtle ſpeaks of Redemption in particular application, for the words preceeding, *v.* 13. are *who hath delivered us from the power of darkneſs, and hath tranſlated us into the Kingdom of his dear Son.* verſe 14. *In whom we have redemption.*

§. 5. *Actual Remiſſion is ſubſequent to Juſtification, for we muſt be ſuppoſed firſt to have performed the condition, and be pronounced righteous, and then pardoned, when there is no remiſſion then but doth go before or follow Juſtification, it cannot be made the very act it ſelf of Juſtification. Reſp.* Let us try a little for it: 1. He ſaith, *actual remiſſion is ſubſequent to Juſtification*; now we are come into Mr. *Cl*'s. road, he ſeems not to be ſo well acquainted with the Myſtery of the *antecedent remiſſion*, and its ſo indeed, for it ſeems it is but potential remiſſion, its not actual, nay its a contingent *potentia*, there is pardon, and none pardoned, the meaning is, that the New Law made all the world pardonable upon a contingent condition.

2. We find a pretty odd invention, here's Juſtification beſet with Remiſſion, before and behind, and yet no Remiſſion in it; a man pardoned and not juſtified, and then juſtified and not pardoned; and truly, if this ſubſequent Pardon be no better than the antecedent, the *Neonomian* Juſtification is deſtitute of Pardon before and behind too. I wonder all *Proteſtant* Divines do not nauſeate ſuch Whims as theſe.

3. But is it poſſible that he ſhould ſay, *that pardon cannot be made the act of Juſtification*; ſurely the'e forget what they are talking of, is it not conditional Pardon the New Law promiſeth, how can there be Juſtification by the New Law of him that performs the condition, but by pardon in the act of Juſtification; for if the New Law ſaith, *believe and thou ſhalt be pardoned*, the new law when it juſtifies the Believer muſt pardon him, and now we have help at a dead lift, juſt now it was, that tho our new law could juſtifie, yet it could not pardon; but we are fain to go to the old Law Bar to fetch a Pardon, and trouble Chriſt about it too, but we have found now that the new law can pardon; for if it pardon all the World conditionally, it can pardon particular perſons actually, when they perform the conditions.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The Neonomian Doctrine of Juſtification Examined.

Section 1. *Mr.* H's. *Definition of Juſtification.* §. 2. *Imperfect Obedience not to be accepted by God to Juſtification.* §. 3. *Juſtification not without Life.* §. 4. *Of the Form of Juſtification.* 5. *What is the account of Chriſt's righteouſneſs.* §. 6. *Chriſt's Merits put to account are imputed.* §. 7. *Diſtinction between Pardon, and bearing with our defects.* §. 8. *A Pardon general, becomes abſolute.* §. 9. *Juſtification by Infuſion and by Imputation diſtinguiſhed.* §. 10. *Of Juſtifying the Ungodly.* §. 11. *Whether Old Law Righteouſneſs or New be beſt.* §. 12. *Mr.* H's. *Myſtery, which he ſaith* Dr. O. *did not underſtand.*

MR. *H.* defines Juſtification thus, *It is an act of God's free Grace, whereby God imputes to every ſound Believer his Faith for Righteouſneſs, upon the account of Chriſt's Satisfaction and Merit, giving him Pardon and Life as the benefits of it.* Right. of God, p. 25.

Reſp. For the Genus he refers the proof to the *Aſſembly*, but he repreſenteth himſelf ſhort of the *Aſſembly*, who ſay, *Juſtification is an act of God's free Grace unto ſinners*, for which they quote *Rom.* 3. 21, 24, 25. Now Juſtification barely conſidered as ſuch, is an act of Juſtifice, unleſs it be ſpoken with this condition, and I find Mr. *H*'s. Notion of it will not bear this connection; for his Juſtification is of a perſon only, that is ſubjectively righteous, our Juſtification and his are diſtinguiſhed *toto genere*, for he ſaith, the object of his Juſtification is a righteous perſon, to ſuch an one Juſtification is due; its no act of Grace to juſtifie ſuch an one, a ſound Believer. By *Faith* he means Repentance and New Obedience, as the conditional terms of the New Law, which being performed by any one, he is not juſtified by free Grace, but legally he can challenge it by the New Law.

§. 2.

§. 2. *This Faith and New Obedience, tho imperfect, God accepts in the room of perfect righteousness, not accounting it perfect. Resp.* It is absurd to say, God accepts it in the room of perfect; for if so, it should come in, in place and room of the perfect in the Covenant of Works, God putting out that condition, and putting in this, but this imperfect comes as terms in another law, so it hinders not the terms of another. 2. No, why should God account it perfect if it be as they say, but the law of God is perfect, and tho God judgeth the righteousness morally imperfect in comparison of the righteousness of the first law, yet he must reckon it a perfect condition of the new law, it being as much as the law requires, and therefore a condition perfectly performed for else it can never be pleaded or imputed at its Bar; but he saith, he accepts it, if he accept it its by its self, or for the sake of a better righteousness; now no law can accept any righteousness by its self, but it must be esteemed by its self to be a full righteousness compleatly to answer the demands of the said law; if the law accept it for or in the righteousness of another, it thereby declares the insufficiency of the man's own righteousness being such as the law cannot justifie him for; but the sufficiency of the other righteousness for which he justifies him, this now will bring in Christ and his obedience into the new law, where our *Neonomians* will permit him to have nothing to do, but only as a Legislator, as for his Obedience and Satisfaction, it belonged to the old law only, with purchase of the new-remedying law. Lastly, its Nonsence, that any law, or God in a law, should impute Faith and Obedience for righteousness which is not perfectly so, according to the law constitution, but he doth it upon the account of the Merits and Satisfaction of Christ: How upon the account? and is the Merits and Satisfaction of Christ put in the Ballance with our imperfect righteousness to make it up? or is Christ's righteousness imputed to it that it cannot be, unless imputed to the person? which he denies, how then must we understand this Gentleman? for the Satisfaction and Merits of Christ is only effective, because Christ was so kind as to purchase Merit, and satisfie God for the new law, without which he could not have been justified by our imperfect righteousness, and this is all they intend by it, for the Merits of Christ's sake, a plain and facile simile may be given, A Man ows a great deal of Money to his Creditor that's suing of him in Court, a friend of the Debtor and Creditor interposeth and brings the Creditor to a Composition of 10 *s.* 5 *s.* or 1 *s.* in the pound; these Writings brought into the Court, the Action is dismissed for the Merits, Purchase and procurement of this person, who now brought the Debtor under the new law of Com-

Compoſition, which if the Debtor do not pay he is ſuible upon his Compoſition: Now this is all theſe men make of the Merits of Chriſt, its only his bringing God to the New Law Compoſition.

§. 3. *Pardon and Life*, he adds, *as effects of Juſtification*: We have already ſhewed what an abſurd thing Juſtification is without Pardon, Pardon being eſſential to it; but it ſeems to be as abſurd, if not more, that there ſhould be Juſtification without life; for if by condemnation a man be dead in law, then certainly, by Juſtification, wherein Condemnation is taken off, the perſon is made alive in law. But Mr. *H.* will have a man to be juſtified, and both ly under the guilt and condemnation of ſin; for he adds to theſe which he calls Benefits, *a right to impunity*; ſo that Juſtification lays but in the foundation of impunity, they are not from under punity, Juſtification brings only an expectation of Pardon, Life, Impunity hereafter, but none of theſe are in hand.

§. 4. *When I ſay, this Righteouſneſs (or Faith) is the form, I underſtand it in the ſence as theſe Divines do, who ſay, Chriſts righteouſneſs is the form, or Remiſſion is the form, not the form of that Imputation, but of Juſtification paſſively taken. Reſp.* Then the plain meaning is that Mr. *Humph.* underſtands our righteouſneſs to have that place in cauſality of Juſtification, which others give to the righteouſneſs of Chriſt; if other Divines ſay, that Chriſt's is the formal reaſon of Juſtification, in the ſenſe that they take Chriſt's righteouſneſs to be the formal cauſe in the perſon juſtified, he takes a man's own righteouſneſs to ſtand *in genere cauſalitatis*, this is Diametrical Oppoſition, and therefore not only to be ſcrupled, but to be contradicted and deteſted. Hum. *Not the form of that Imputation, but of Juſtification paſſively taken. Reſp.* Mr. *H.* confounds his Notion by his obſcure Logick; for there is a great difference between the form of a thing, and *formalis ratio agentis*, the form is an eſſential cauſe, and enters the effect, the effect made up of the *vis* of all the cauſes hath exiſtence from concourſe of all the cauſes, the *formalis ratio* is *cauſa movens efficientem, & non ingreditur effectum*, tho the form doth, which is another thing. Now Juſtification in the abſtract is *forma juſtificationis in concreto*, or in the perſon juſtified, and there is not any other form, as *Juſtitia* is the form of *juſtus*, or of a man imputed juſt, that the imputation makes him legally juſt, to be juſt and imputed ſo is one thing in law, and to be juſtified is another. Now the juſtice of a man is the form of the juſt man, and the *formalis ratio* of Juſtification, and this he ſaith is the form of Juſtification paſſively taken; this we deny, and for Juſtification is active, but the

the juſtified is the paſſive, where Juſtification it ſelf is the form. Again, we deny that our righteouſneſs is the *formalis ratio* of Juſtification; Remiſſion indeed belongs to the form it ſelf, but the *formalis ratio* of Juſtification is external to the form, and therefore to be conſidered apart from it. This only by the way

§. 5. *I add at laſt upon the account of Chriſts Merits, or through Chriſt, or for Chriſts ſake, becauſe this faith of ours, or Evangelick Righteouſneſs, hath ſo many defects in the beſt Chriſtians, that if thro the ſacrifice of Chriſt they were not pardoned, and through his Merits thoſe imperfect duties which are done accepted, it could not be imputed to us for Righteouſneſs. Reſp.* Chriſt is beholden to him to bring him at laſt, tho but at the fagg end of Juſtification: But how comes Juſtification to be at laſt upon the account of Chriſt, for we are formally juſtified upon the account of our own righteouſneſs, *i. e.* perfectly ſo, for what is formally exiſtent is perfectly ſo, and that by our own righteouſneſs, *i. e.* upon the account of it, for the effect *quod è cauſis exiſtit*, is ſuch upon the account of all the cauſes, but eſpecially upon account of the form; now he that is formally thus juſtified, muſt be upon all accounts juſtified, and needs nothing to be added to it: Why then upon the account of Chriſt's Merits? why, becauſe Chriſt purchaſed a law of righteouſneſs which could not juſtifie perfectly, but leaves the perſon juſtified in a need of further righteouſneſs for Juſtification, if the Merits and Sacrifice of Chriſt muſt come in upon the account of which a man is juſtified, then he is not juſtified before, and Chriſt's righteouſneſs is the juſtifying righteouſneſs only; for our own leaves us unjuſtified by Mr. *H*'s own confeſſion, *i. e.* it leaves us in ſuch a caſe that no man of ſenſe can ſay we are juſtified; for by his own words, the righteouſneſs of the new law is not, cannot be imputed to us for righteouſneſs, unleſs it be pardoned and accepted in Jeſus Chriſt, and therefore this law cannot juſtifie any one upon his inherent righteouſneſs, for its moſt abſurd to ſay, it can juſtifie, when it cannot impute its own righteouſneſs by reaſon of the defects thereof.

§. 6. I find Mr. *H.* is at a great loſs in eſtabliſhing his Notion upon a right bottom, he ſeems to ſuſpect that Chriſt may come off a loſer by it, and he will moſt fearfully. *I do more eſpecially ſignifie thereby that Chriſts righteouſneſs which cannot be imputed to us as a formal cauſe of our Juſtification is and muſt be very carefully brought to our account, and granted to be imputed, and the meritorious cauſe of our acceptation.*

Reſp. I am glad to ſee this ſaying, wherein he hath overthrown his own Doctrine, tho uttered in a great contradiction; for he ſaith, Chriſt's cannot be imputed, and then it muſt be imputed

puted; but why cannot it in the first place? That which is put to our account in Justification, whether as to the part or to the whole of our righteousness is imputed, but according to Mr. *H.* the Merits of Christ's is put to our account, and therefore the Merits of Christ (to speak more distinctly) thus put to our account, are the *materialis & formalis ratio* of our Justification; for if the merits of Christ be put to our account in Justification, its but trifling to say, its only the effects, if one man pay for another in part or whole, its the money it self paid that is put to his account, and therefore imputed to him in Court; and indeed he ingeniously confesseth he learned of Mr. *B.* to mend his Notion, and allowed Christ's Merit to be the material cause of our Justification; but that which he amends with one hand he spoils with another, and thereby runs into grosser logical Absurdities, saying, *Because I make our faith the formal in Justification. Resp.* Very good, The matter is in one subject, in Christ, and the form in us another; *Causa per qua res est id quod est* is in us, *ex qua* in Christ in a legal act, Christ's righteousness is but generical, matter which is as much for all the world as a Believer; but the formal part, the *proprium & differentia* is in the subject, Man; this in law is always the meritorious part; Money in general turns no Cause there, but its the Propriety that this or that man hath that doth it; now its not Christ's righteousness in special that doth the business, but righteousness in general that Christ hath brought in, as a material part, but its mans righteousness in special that is the principal essential cause, according to Mr. *H.*

§. 7. *After this I distinguish between this pardoning, and bearing with the defects of our Faith, Repentance and new Obedience, which are the condition of the Gospel Covenant, and so our Gospel Righteousness, or that which is Imputed for Righteousness; and that General or Total Pardon,* &c. *Resp.* If Justification be upon performing these as a law condition, what need all this talk about bearing with our defects? If the Gospel Covenant run in these Terms, he that doth what he can shall live; therefore Man doing what he can, leaves no room for bearing with defects, he fulfils the Law in doing what he can. Again, if this be imputed to us for righteousness by the law, and we discharged and declared righteous thereon, it is enough. Where also observe what imputation the *Neonomians* owns, its imputation of our own righteousness to our selves: And such a righteousness as is none, because imperfect and sinful; but yet imputed for righteousness to us, as if it were perfect; what's the reason then that its found defective after imputation, if imperfect by imputation comes in the room and doth as well as perfect?

Nay,

Nay, what's the reason that this righteousness that is such a paultrey one, which can do nothing (by their own concession) in Justification without Christs, must have the honour of being imputed to us? but Christ must not, cannot be imputed, and why I pray? Because tho' its acknowledged to be perfect and compleateſt righteousness, yet it may not be imputed to us for ours, because performed by Christ and not by us. I pray let me ask, whether it would not more comport with the honour of God, the nature of a Gospel and common Reason, to impute legally to a delinquent the payment of another which is perfect full and compleat, then to impute to him the payment of his whole debt, for 10 *per Cent.* or 6 *d.* or 4 *d.* Nay, after this acceptance how honourable would it be to the Court, to sue to the King for the pardon of the Prisoner for paying so little.

§. 8. But let us come to the other part of the distinction —— *And that general and total Pardon which the Covenants promises, and becomes Absolute upon performing the Condition. Resp.* Either the *Neonomians* have lost their understandings, or think all other Men have, and so thiuk they may impose what they please upon them; for here he distinguishes betwixt a conditional Gospel Covenant, and a Gospel Covenant upon conditions, a total Covenant and a partial, a total upon conditions, and a partial absolute upon performance of conditions, and all these one new law Covenant; a Covenant that pardons upon conditions, and a Covenant absolutely pardoning upon conditions. The total pardon, if that which pardons all the World upon conditions not performed, and yet it damns them too for non performances, a pardoning Covenant that damns all, for it remains not a pardon upon conditions when any one performs the conditions, its then absolute; but did ever any one know that a conditional Covenant when the condition is performed absolute, *i.e.* without conditions? if any Man buy a House of his Neighbour for a Summ of Money, will he say after he has paid his Money, my Neighbour gave me this House, for an absolute promise is a promise of free Gift. He proceeds, *The one of these is that very Grace, or Act of Grace it self, as goes into that Act of Imputation, or Act that imputes our Faith for Righteousness when the other still is the Effect or benefit following justification.* Resp. The Man is in a Wood: *The one of these an act of Grace*, which of them? That which hath conditional pardon without performance, or that which upon performance becomes absolute, the total general, or the partial, particular, which I know not, but one it is; that is an Act of Grace going into the Act of Imputation: Imputation is an Act of Justice in strict acceptation, because its never but of righteousness, tho' to bring righteousness to a sinner, to whom the Law imputes righteousness

ouſneſs is an act of Grace, as Juſtification is, but it muſt not be his own righteouſneſs, for that excludes Grace.

§. 9. He is a little cautious of Mr. *B*'s. opinion, *that Juſtification is the making us righteous*, but he ſaith he will diſtinguiſh, *there is a making a Man juſt by infuſion or by Imputation; that by infuſion, is Regeneration, which the* Papiſts *hold, and which we diſtinguiſh from Juſtification.*

Reſ. The righteouſneſs by which they'll have a man juſtified is that of Regeneration, and that of Works, the *Papiſts* way has more of Grace in it, becauſe theirs is Juſtification of the ungodly, as Regeneration is Sanctifying the ungodly. Some he ſaith are for Juſtification by pardon, and ſo a Man is righteous by non-imputation of Sin, but he is not for this neither, becauſe he keeps pardon and non imputation of Sin for a conſequent of Juſtification; he will have a Man juſt in the Eye of the Law, and yet under the imputation of Sin; well how will he have it to be? Its by imputation of what righteouſneſs? Chriſts? no, its by Imputation of our Faith to us for righteouſneſs.——*Our Faith and Evangelical Obedience being imperfect and ſinful, and we are unrighteous in the Eye of the Law for all that, but God in his judging us according to the Law of Grace, doth allow of that,* [*i. e.* Sin] *for Chriſt's ſake, inſtead of all which the Law requires to our Juſtification.*

Reſp. Here you ſee what a parcel of righteouſneſs this New Law righteouſneſs is, its imperfect ſinful as to Sins of omiſſion and commiſſion and we are for all this righteous in the eye of the moral Law, but God judging by the Law of Grace, he allows all the Sin againſt his own Law for Chriſt's ſake, Chriſt hath merited Gods allowing our ſinful righteouſneſs, *i. e.* Unrighteouſneſs and juſtified us for it, but ſeeing here is all this done by the Law of Grace, how comes it to paſs that it doth not pardon theſe Sins, but they muſt go to another Bar for Pardon? Why, becauſe the Law of Grace, tho' it juſtifies the performer it pardons no Sin, becauſe no Law can ſuppoſe its own condition to be ſinful, but if there be Sin in the condition (as theſe Men ſay again and again there is) the Law of Grace allows it, (its certainly an *Antinomian* Law) allows that Sin that Gods moſt Holy Law condemns, God here muſt deny himſelf; and to ſay he allows it for Chriſts ſake, is to make Chriſt the Miniſter of Sin, die for allowance of Sin, and eſtabliſhing of it by Law, and if God by a new Law hath eſtabliſhed this ſinful Obedience inſtead of all which the old Law required, what need of asking pardon of the ſaid Law? Gods abolition or relaxation of the old Law, and ſetting us upon Obedience to a New Law, and the performances thereof inſtead of what the old Law required, freed us from Sin and there needs no pardon for not performing

ing perfect obedience, for that would have been ſin in the eye of the new law, it requiring imperfect obedience, imperfection and ſinfulneſs being the formality of the condition, and therefore it muſt needs forbid perfection as moſt contrary to it, and condemn all glorified Saints.

§. 10. *By this may that expreſſion of the Apoſtle be rightly underſtood, God juſtifies the ungodly,* not in ſenſu diviſo, *ſo that he that is ſo before his Juſtification is no longer ſo afterwards, but* in ſenſu compoſito, *our Faith or Evangelical Obedience in regard to the law* [he ſhould have ſaid the law of Works] *or in regard of thoſe Works that are required by the law to our juſtification, are no righteouſneſs within its own nature* [therefore unrighteous] *would juſtifie us; but God conſtitutes it ſo by the law of the Goſpel, and according to that law imputes it to us for righteouſneſs.*

Reſp. I need ſay no more to this, but that it is both *in ſenſu diviſo & compoſito* an ungodly interpretation, That God ſhould make that righteouſneſs by an after law, which he had made moral unrighteouſneſs by a former; and impute that by one law for righteouſneſs to Juſtification, which he had imputed by another law for ſin to condemnation: Is God as Man that he ſhould ly, or as the Son of Man that he ſhould repent? The ſence of the place is not difficult, it is that juſtifies a ſinner as ſuch, or elſe its no act of Free Grace, that when the Grace of Juſtification toucheth on the perſon of a ſinner, he is no more godly than when the Grace of Regeneration toucheth upon him; tho the Grace of God lays hold on a ſinner in both theſe reſpects, finding them ungodly in all reſpects, yet it leaves them not ſo: His enſuing Suppoſition is very impertinent, ſuppoſing that which never was nor never will be, *viz.* That a Believer living regenerate can never be juſtified by the law of works, by his own righteouſneſs; No, he can be juſtified by no law, neither did God ever make any law to account any mans unrighteouſneſs, righteouſneſs: I can call that unrighteouſneſs which the law of Works condemns, and God never intended by his Grace, nor Chriſt never died to purchaſe ſuch a *Juſtification*; far be it.

§. 11. Mr. *H.* ſhewing ſome diſreliſh of Mr. *B.* for agreeing with *Bellarmine* and the Council of *Trent* in the Doctrine *of Infuſion*, which he ſaith he took up of *Le Blanc*, *That God doth make men righteous by inherent Grace before he doth juſtifie them.* A thing that Mr. *H.* muſt grant according to his Principles, tho he will diſtinguiſh *nomine tenus* only, as to the ſame thing, calling inherent Grace in reſpect of Juſtification righteouſneſs, and in reſpect of Sanctification Holineſs, according to a ſuppoſed different imputation. He accordingly diſtinguiſheth of a threefold making

a man juſt. 1. *By Converſion or Regeneration, and this* Auguſtine *and the* Papiſts [he might have added Mr. *B.* and the *Quakers.*] 2. *By Pardon, and this is Mr.* Wotton's. *Or* 3. *By the righteouſneſs of God, and this is my Juſtification, I will call it mine.*

Reſp. As he underſtands the righteouſneſs of God much good may it do him. I deſire it not, I know no ſound *Proteſtant* will put in for a ſhare in his Righteouſneſs or Juſtification, nor deſire either like his. We will let him alone to chide the *Papiſts* about infuſion of righteouſneſs, and let him clear himſelf from being a *Papiſt* in the Point of *Juſtification* if he can; let us ſee how he acquits himſelf, *The* Papiſts *Opinion is, that the Grace of God infuſed is the formal righteouſneſs that juſtifies us according to the law of works*; *they of* Trent *thought of no other*; *but our imperfect Faith and new Obedience is a conformity to that which God hath made a condition of life by the law of Grace, and is our formal righteouſneſs according to that law, being made ſo by God when he imputes it to us for righteouſneſs. By the Evangelical Law this is our righteouſneſs*; *we are made righteous*, i. e. *not guilty of the non-performance of the condition, according to Mr.* B.

Reſp. According to his own Quotation the *Papiſts* hold as *Mr. B.* and he, *that habitual righteouſneſs is infuſed by God, ſo far as that a man endued therewith may be accounted truly righteous*; they do ſuggeſt that they do not intend a perfect righteouſneſs, but ſo much as may admit at leaſt of an acceptillation, which *Mr. H.* gives us to underſtand the *Neonomians* approve of, and *Mr. Fox* and others tell us the Notion of a New Law was long ago among the *Papiſts*, and there's no doubt now our *Neonomians* have ſo briskly Trumpt up that old muſty piece of *Popery*, they will willingly fall in Hand-and-Glove with them, and rectifie their flaws according to the *Neonomian* Edition, they will call their works Evangelical, and calculate them to the height of the new Law, and carry all their merits thither, ſeeing there's in all probability the faireſt Market, and they bear the beſt Price there, their unrighteouſneſs will be called righteouſneſs, and his ſins will be allowed, there is no need of ſo many Indulgences, for one new-law-allowance will paſs for all. Again, do not the *Papiſts* ſpeak of the ſame Works, Faith, Repentance, New Obedience? and what if they ſay they are the meaſure of conformity to the Law of Works? do they ſay they are juſtified by them abſolutely conſidered? do they not ſay for the ſake of *Chriſt's Merits?* why may not they be as well juſtified by the old-law-works for the merits of Chriſt's righteouſneſs as our *Neonomians*, by a new-law-righteouſneſs through the merits of Chriſt's righteouſneſs; for of the two, I had a thouſand times rather truſt to Juſtification by an old law

law righteousness through the merits of Christ, than to a new-law-righteousness through our own merits; for *Paul* we know, and the old law we know, but as for the new law and the righteousness thereof, we say, who are ye? and what is the Evangelical? in plain *English*, it is a plain contradiction to the law of works; when that chargeth all the world as guilty before God, this new law saith sin maketh them not guilty, but is their righteousness; and the Evangelical Law finds them not guilty of non performance of the condition. The *Moral* law saith, if a man kills another he is guilty of non-performance of the condition, but the *Evangelical* saith, tho he kills a man, if he repent, and give some Alms, his killing a man makes his other obedience but imperfect, which is the true nature of the condition, and therefore he is not guilty of the non-performance of the condition.

§. 12. There's a mystery here which he saith Dr. *O.* nor *Mr. B.* never gave its due consideration, for Dr. *O.* saith, *There's an imputation of a thing to us that is ours, and that is judging it ours, and dealing with us accordingly, or of a thing that is not ours, and that is by donation, and dealing with us according to it made ours, our righteousness cannot, but Christs righteousness must be imputed to our Justification.* To which he thus answers, *As there is an imputing to a man a thing that is his, and a thing not his, so there is an imputing to a person that which is partly his, and partly not his, but that which in the effect becomes his by imputation, this never sunk into the Dr's mind.*

Resp. Sure the Doctor was a very shallow man, that he could think of the imputation of a thing that is ours, and of a thing not ours, and could not think of a thing partly ours, and partly not ours, but the reason of his not mentioning of it was because he did not think any man of consistent Brains, would propose such a Justification. *For* saith *Mr. H. there are two things in the matter, our Faith and God's Imputation ——Faith, Repentance and new Obedience is one thing, and having it accepted is another.* Now here lies the mystery, its the making one thing two, our new obedience is ours, and sanctification, but God's Imputation makes it ours for Justification, but its being ours, doth not God esteem and judge it ours? how comes it now ours? if God esteem it our righteousness, how is it less ours than before? unless it be in this manner, a man hath a Cloth Coat on, this is his, another calls it a Silk Coat, this is not his because he had no Silk Coat, but his Cloth Coat is made a Silk Coat by another in imputing it Silk; but he tells us, *God's imputation brings nothing with it (in the effect, I say) that which was not ours, i. e. the Satisfaction and Merits of Christ.* Doth the imputation of ours, at the same time

impute the Satisfaction and Merits of Christ? if so, then it doth bring something not ours, and then we are justified by two righteousnesses, by ours and not ours; or will he have this a single imputation, and both these made one, by mixture partly ours and partly Christs? for this answers his Notion best, partly his, and partly not his; but he excludes Christ's merits from imputation again and again, *ergo* the imputation is only of that which is ours, and his Distinction is a Chimæra, and if Dr. *O.* did not trouble his head with such Whims his Consideration is not to be blamed. But he tells us, *that which is not ours comes after imputation as an effect, the Satisfaction and Merits of Christ*; but they become not ours by imputation, therefore one leg of his distribution is dropt off, for he saith, *there's an imputation of a thing ours, and a thing not ours*; this thing *not ours*, which is *Christ's satisfaction*, he saith is not imputed, but comes in *as an effect of this imputation of our own righteousness*; but why must Christ's Satisfaction come in the rear? because a man must be justified first, and then Christ's Satisfaction must come in to mend the faults of his Justification, as a remedying righteousness, the formal part of his Justification must be pardoned and accepted, and before his Justification hath released the man from condemnation and unacceptableness to God, he must have *the effect* of his Justification; hence this imputation of ours is the cause of our pardon and acceptation by Christ's Merits, an imputation of our immoral righteousness the cause of a perfect. But how can we have pardon through the Satisfaction of Christ, and acceptance through his merits, without God's imputation of them to us? for if by the rules of Justice in the New Law Court our righteousness is imputed to us, how comes it to pass that when we come sinners into the old law Court, we can there become righteous, free from condemnation, and accepted by Satisfaction and Merit, and yet not have it imputed to us? this is most extra-judicial, for a Court always imputes that satisfaction and merit to the person discharged, which is paid into Court for it: It were easie to run endlesly upon shewing the gross absurdities of this Divinity; for they will have the New Law to impute righteousness which they say is no righteousness, and the Old Laws righteousness to be good and perfect, but not imputed; so that indeed, according to their Doctrine, the sinner is ruin'd for want of righteousness: Under the New Law is no righteousness, and under the Old Law good righteousness but no imputation, without which a sinner can never be justified; now if they would permit these two laws to meet and agree the matter, something might be done, then the New Law might borrow the Old Laws righteousness, and the Old, the New Laws Imputation.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Formal Cauſe of Juſtification.

Section 1. *Mr.* H's *Diſtinction of* by *and* for, *according to* Bellarmine. §. 2. *The Diſtinction conſidered.* §. 3. *Juſtification purchaſed by Chriſt.* §. 4. *They advance not God's Grace in Juſtification.* §. 5. Papiſts *truer than* Neonomians *in the Doctrine.* §. 6. *They ſay the ſame with the* Papiſts, *and confeſs it.* §. 7. *The Errors and Weakneſſes of their Opinions.* §. 8. *Of Active and Paſſive Juſtification.* §. 9. *Of Condition and Duty.*

Sect. 1. MR. *H.* for the better eſtabliſhment of the *Neonomian* Doctrine hath taken up a diſtinction from his friend Cardinal *Bellarmine*. *The* Proteſtants (ſaith Mr. *H.*) *have denied that Faith is our formal Righteouſneſs*; (Righ. p. 46.) *the reaſon of the denial hath bin much, becauſe they have confounded the* cauſa per quam, & propter quam, *by Faith ſaith the Scripture we are juſtified, by is* id per quod cauſa formalis, *but Chriſts Righteouſneſs is* id propter quod: Let us ſee out of whoſe Shop he took this Diſtinction, *Bellarmine* (*de juſt. lib.*2. c.2.) having ſtated the Queſtion. *Whether Righteouſneſs inherent in us, be the formal cauſe of abſolute Fuſtification or not?* In order to his defence of it in the Affirmative, hath this diſtinction, and chargeth *Kemnitius* with fraudulent dealing in ſtating the Queſtion, becauſe he put *id propter quod*, inſtead of *per quam*, ſaith: *If one will ſpeak properly, he muſt not uſe the Word* propter, *but* per, *when he will point out the formal cauſe of Fuſtification. If any one ask by what doth a Man live? By what do the Stars ſhine? By what is the Fire hot? It will be anſwer'd by his Soul, by the Light, by the Heat, which are the formal cauſes; but if any ask wherefore did the Emperour Triumph, wherefore did the Souldiers fight. It will be anſwered not by giving the formal cauſe, but the meritorious and final, the Souldiers fight that they may overcome, the Emperour triumphs becauſe he overcame*; ſo Kemnitius *if he had ſpoken without fraud and properly ſhould have ſaid, what is that by which a*

Man is Justified; *whether the Righteousness given to him of God, and inherent through the Merits of Christ, or the Merits of Christ from without him imputed?* Now *Bellarmine* having so fully acquainted us with the distinction, according to the full sense of Mr. *H.* I think it will be but loss of Paper and Time to transcribe what Mr. *H.* saith of it, again and again, being but all to the same intention of the Cardinal.

§. 2. This distinction duly considered is but one of the *Papists* shifts and Evasions, for *First*, In all juridical proceedings *causa per quam est causa propter quam*, for a Mans righteousness is that by which and for which he is justified, and so his transgression is that by which and reason wherefore he is condemned, and if meritorious righteousness of a Mans own or of anothers is brought into Plea and be admitted, he is said to be justified by it, if it be enquired how came such an one to be acquitted, the Answer will be by his Innocency; how came such an one to be condemned, the Answer will as soon be by, as for Wickedness, all Righteousness by which any one is Justified is *propter quam*, its that by Reason whereof he is Justified, why doth the New Law justifie him that hath performed the condition, is his Righteousness the Justifying condition, is not the Justification *propter conditionem*, if it doth refuse to Justifie, because the condition is not performed, then it justifies not, because it is not performed; in all conditional Covenants the promise is performed, by reason of the performance of the condition. 2. Again, if this Distinction were True as applied, then we should be said to be justified or reconciled still *propter sanguinem Christi*, but we are said to be *justified by his Death*. ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, ἐν, is rendred (') by (') *not*, for, *Rom.* 5. 9. *Are reconciled to God*, διὰ τὸν θανάτον τοῦ υἱοῦ, *By the Death of his Son*, for *dia* with a Genitive Case signifies *per*, with an Accusative *propter*, *ver.* 10. So, *we have Redemption*, διὰ τοῦ αἵματος, So, *Colos.* 1. 14. 20. Is rendred *through*, but they that have knowledge of the prepositions know *by* or *through* are the same, when a thing is done *by*, its done *through*, See, *Acts* 20. 28. the Church of God which he hath purchased, διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, so that its evident that the distinction will not hold to make Evangelick Obedience *causa per quam*, and Christs Obedience *propter quam*, because Christs Obedience is said to be *per quam*, when it is intended thereby to be the very righteousness unto Justification, *ergo*, *per quam* and *propter quam* are of the same import in a juridical sence; but that which our *Neonomians* and *Papists* aim at is an immediate and mediate righteousness, that we are justified by one as immediate for the sake of Christ's the mediate.

§. 3.

§. 3. *The* Papists *by this distinction would make way for a double righteousness in our Justification; for the Council of* Trent *doth anathematize those that say, a man is justified only by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, or only by remission of sins, without inherent Grace and Charity.* To this purpose our *Neonomian* Mr. *Cl.* p. 35. *That the merit of Christ's Death and Sufferings* [he excluding his active obedience] *hath purchased this priviledge for us among others, that sincere faith should be accounted for righteousness, and that God will account us righteous if we be possest thereof.*

Resp. In both these we see Christ's righteousness is made the *propter quam*, and our own the *per quam*, Christ's the meritorious of our Justification by our own righteousness, whereby the ascribing any essential causality to Christ's righteousness is out of doors: For

1. The Justification by our own (') is entire in all essential causes without Christ's; for our righteousness imputed must be the material as well as the formal part of our Justification.

2. It must be first imputed and we justified by it, for they make not only the Condition but the Imputation thereof, and Justification thereby (') to be conditional of our pardon and acceptance by Christ's Righteousness.

3. The very righteousness of our own is imputed, not Christs Righteousness at all, only the effects; cause and effects are *oppositi*, therefore if the effects only, then not the righteousness it self.

4. To say that Christ purchased Justification by our own righteousness, is but to make Christ such a remote cause of Justification as Election is. Now to talk that the condition by which we are justified is a formal cause, and yet to be no cause, is non-sence, for a formal cause, altho it be *sine qua non*, and so is every cause, yet the four immediate causes are not only so, and this distinguisheth them as *propter* immediate causes, whose *vis* enters the effect, when *causa sine qua non*, as to the effect, is only antecedent, or *causa causæ*, and enters not the effect spoken of.

But Mr. *H.* saith, *its a cause as well as a condition, it is both, if we made our works to justifie us* sub genere causæ efficientis, procatarct. *and so the meritorious cause, it were to bring our works into the office of Christ's Righteousness, and derogate from Grace.*

Resp. So they do notwithstanding all they say, for if they thrust out Christ's Righteousness from any essential part of our Justification, as they do, not allowing it materiality or formality therein, they put our own Works into Christ's Office; and nothing can be more derogatory to the Grace of God; they say, they make it *modus efficientis, causa procatarchtica*, an external motive to the

efficient; the effect then in that respect falls on the efficient, but the effect of the efficient is another thing: Supposing God justifies as Judge, Christ's Righteousness by way of Merit falls upon him, and procures of him that he takes our righteousness in payment. We may use this Similitude, a Man is prosecuted before a Judge for an hundred Pounds, a Friend of the Defendant tampers with the Jury and Judge, and procures of them that the Debtor pay but 10 *l.* I pray, whether is he justified by paying the 10 *l.* in Court, or by that which the Judge and Jury received, which is not brought in Plea at all? so that all meritorious righteousness is brought in Plea *coram Judice*, and accordingly being imputed or not, Judgment passeth. The Righteousness of Christ, whatever it may purchase out of the Court of the New Law, its not allowed there as a Plea, and is never, nay cannot be imputed (these men say) though pleaded, therefore no Justification thereby, for no man is justified legally, but by what is imputed.

§. 4. *But when we make it the formal cause only (of our passive Justification) we do nothing thereby but advance God's Grace and Christ's Merits, as having obtained for us, not only that God should require of us no other condition but our Faith or inchoate Righteousness unto life, but also that he should constitute by his New Law this condition performed to be our righteousness, in the room of that perfect one required of the old.* p. 47. *of right.*

Resp. Note, 1. They do something besides advancing the Grace of God, because it makes Justification due to us upon Debt, for he that hath a formal right-ousness of his own legally imputed to him, he may demand Justification as due to him by the law it self, and this is not to advance Grace, but contrary, if the Apostle speak sence, *Rom.* 4.

2. It is not an advance of Christ's Merits, for it casts it out of Imputation and Justification, and makes it but a *causa sine qua non*, it casts them out of the essential causes, and it makes them but an adjuvant cause, or con-cause, a co-ordinate (according to Mr. *H.*) it makes not Christ's Merits the only righteousness; it makes our own righteousness the inchoate and foundation righteousness, the Corner Stone of our Justification; and whereas the Scriptures make Christ's, it makes Christ's Righteousness but to belong to another law, whereby they say we are not justified and our own to that which justifies, and the only justifying righteousness of the new law; it makes Christ's Righteousness and our Pardon by it, to be a consequent of Justification by our own, and that without imputation thereof extra-judicial, but our own very righteousness to be imputed to us; it makes that righteousness within its self

ſelf and own nature, (ſaith Mr. *H.* again and again) to be righteouſneſs legal for our Juſtification, and rejects Chriſt's perfect Righteouſneſs as to Imputation and Juſtification, which is contrary to the Holineſs and Juſtice of God.

3. He makes the Grace of God to conſiſt in conſtituting a Law for Juſtification, which is but part of diſtributive Juſtice, the exerciſe of a Legiſlative Power, and not of Grace to Sinners.

4. The conſtitution of this inchoate righteouſneſs is harder terms than the conſtitution of the righteouſneſs of the Covenant of Works, for Reaſons before given.

5. We ſee what their meaning is of Chriſt's Merits, its only that he purchaſed a new Law, and we ſee what is the *Neonomian* Commutation that they have of late made ſuch a ſtir about, they are for a Commutation; what's that? its a commutation of our righteouſneſs, *i. e.* bringing into the room of the righteouſneſs of the law (*i. e.* Chriſt's) in Juſtification, they deny it in Dr. *C*'s ſence, *i. e.* that our ſins were imputed to Chriſt, and his Righteouſneſs to us; for they expreſly deny both the one and the other.

§. 5. Mr. *H.* *So as* Adam, *if he had perfectly obeyed, his obedience had been his formal righteouſneſs in regard of the law.*

Reſp. His Obedience had bin his material Righteouſneſs, and this imputed to Juſtification had bin his Righteouſneſs clothed with the Form and End, and unleſs we have a material and formal righteouſneſs in regard to the ſame law, we can never be juſtified. *So is this ours in regard to the Goſpel.* *Reſp.* The Goſpel is not a new Law, neither doth it allow our own righteouſneſs, for any in our Juſtification; and is therefore Goſpel, becauſe it doth not. He tells us, *both* Proteſtant *and* Papiſt *are both out in ſaying the law is the rule of that Righteouſneſs which both ſay is the formal reaſon of their Juſtification.*

Reſp. It is the *Neonomians* are out, and worſe than the *Papiſts* in this Point, in that they will bring any other rule of Righteouſneſs for Juſtification, the Law of Works is only *norma officii & judicii* for Righteouſneſs and Juſtification. *They are both out, for the* Papiſts *ſpeaks for inherent Grace, and his Works, ſo as he would have them meritorious, and perfect (pleading for Merit and Perfection) but can never bring them to anſwer the law, but muſt ſtill pray* forgive us our treſpaſſes.

Reſp. The *Papiſts* are righter and more rational here than *Neonomians*, if they differ from them in Merit, they ought not, and Mr. *B.* aſſerts it in his *End of Controverſies*; but whereever the performance of the condition of a law requires Juſtification by the law, there is Merit and muſt be; for ſuch a Performer deſerves

ſerves and merits Juſtification. and the remuneration thereof as much as *Adam*'s ſtanding and performing the condition of the Law of Works, had merited Juſtification thereby. Likewiſe, as to Perfection they are right, for that is a man's Perfection which the Law makes ſo, and juſtifies a man by, the Law matters not what other laws make perfect performance; the Old Law is no rule to the New Law, that's a man's Perfection which the Law that juſtifies him ſaith is the performance of the condition. Mr. *H.* quotes Mr. *B.* for ſaying, the New Law acquits a man from non-performance of the condition; and what need ſuch an one pray for Pardon any more than they that ſay, they are juſtified in Chriſt's Righteouſneſs (the great Cry they make againſt Juſtification in Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, what need ſuch an one pray for Pardon?) for if their Juſtification in and by their own righteouſneſs, be not as perfect diſcharging from guilt by Pardon, as ours is in Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, its not worth a Fig, we deſire no ſuch trifling Juſtifications.

§. 6. *The* Proteſtants *on the other ſide plead for Chriſt's righteouſneſs which anſwers the Rule; but this being without us (though it be upon the account thereof)* id propter quod, *or* cujus merito, *we are juſtified; the* Papiſts *ſay ſtiffly it can never be made formally ours, ſo as to be* propter quod *we are juſtified, and I muſt ſay the ſame, for the Truth is Truth.*

Reſp. Here you have Mr. *H.* plainly confeſſing himſelf a *Papiſt* in the Point of Juſtification, and hence its no wrong to him to ſay he is a *Papiſt* upon his own Confeſſion, and the truth is the truth. He ſaith with the *Papiſts, that this being without us cannot be imputed*; can nothing but what is perſonally done by us be imputed to us? I find no Proof that he makes any where that one man's righteouſneſs cannot be imputed to another, and here it is only becauſe it is without us: What is more common than Sureties to pay the Debts of inſolvent Perſons? and that Chriſt made Payment and Satisfaction for Sinners is moſt plain from Scriptures, though theſe men will deny that the Scripture ſaith any thing thereof, which denial will be tried by us whether there is any weight in it? There are two great Points to be cleared in this Controverſie:

1. Whether the Scripture excludes all inherent righteouſneſs from the Juſtification of a Sinner before God?

2. Whether the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt be imputed to a Sinner for his Juſtification before God? Theſe Queſtions ſhall be maintained by us in the Affirmative, God willing, in their due place.

§. 7. Whereas Mr. *H.* Prides himſelf exceedingly in the ſingu-

ſingularity of his Notion of our Righteouſneſs being the formal cauſe of our Juſtification, any one may ſee it in Cardinal *Bellarmine* and *F. Goodwyn*, from both whom its eaſie to ſhew how the *Neonomians* have taken up their Doctrine; as for the Notion it ſelf it labours under many weakneſſes.

1. That Righteouſneſs in it ſelf is not the formal but the material reaſon of Juſtification, that which induceth the form is a legal Imputation; for if a man be never ſo innocent and righteous, if the Court do not impute him ſo, he ſhall not be juſtified, and if a man be never ſo unrighteous, if the Court impute righteouſneſs to him, he ſhall be juſtified; ſo its here, Imputation is the legal form of Juſtification, and righteouſneſs is but the material only.

2. He makes a formal reaſon without material; for if our own righteouſneſs be the formal reaſon where's the material? he will not make Chriſt's Merits the material; for he brings in them *ſub genere cauſæ efficientis*, beſides he cannot, for it would be very abſurd to place the matter in one ſubject, and the form in another, therefore his formal reaſon is immaterial, and its indeed but an imagenary Chymæra, both his New Law and his Formal Righteouſneſs.

3. Our Righteouſneſs if it be the formal reaſon of our Juſtification, its ſuch as *per quam homo juſtus eſt*, and that is in law always *propter quod*, for no law juſtifies any one; but becauſe he is righteous, his righteouſneſs muſt conſtitute him juſt, and the law eſteeming him ſo, he is juſtified as legally meritorious thereof: the noiſe Mr. *B. F. G.* and others make of the diſtinction between conſtitutive and declarative Juſtification, is *Popiſh*, and hath nothing in it; conſtitutive Juſtification is no more than Imputation, it is that which in law conſtitutes any one juſt and meritorious of declarative Juſtification.

§. 8. Mr. *H.* makes a diſtinction of Juſtification, that its active and paſſive, whereas Juſtification is but one, and it doth not conſtitute properly a phyſical effect, but a legal relation, it doth neither find nor make any ſinner inherently righteous (for Juſtification of a righteous perſon finds him inherently ſo, this Juſtification we ſpeak not of) but Mr. *H.* will have a paſſive Juſtification upon this account, becauſe it finds the ſinner righteous inherently; he ſaith indeed, *the infuſion of this preceeding righteouſneſs is not his Juſtification, according to the* Papiſts, *but his Juſtification is for the righteouſneſs which it finds infuſed, and ſo its the formal cauſe of Juſtification*: He might with much better reaſon ſay, that Sanctification is double, active ſanctifying, and paſſive ſanctified; but where there is the cauſe working, there is the

effect

effect wrought, and the juſtified is but the effect, and conſtitutes no diſtinct ſpecies of it. But we ſay, the Grace of Juſtification of a Sinner, proceeding from Grace, is wholly in and from God, and hath no cauſe in a Sinner material or formal, nor is there any cauſe external of that Grace, the moving cauſe only is the good will and pleaſure of God; *he is gracious to whom he will*; graciouſneſs, pardoning Iniquity is only from his Grace and for the glory of his Grace, which cannot be in the Juſtification of a righteous perſon, but becauſe, not ſimply Grace, but alſo Juſtice ſhall be glorified in a ſinner's juſtification, and God in his pardon, will not clear the guilty, he hath graciouſly provided and beſtowed on the ſinner a righteouſneſs accepted by the Law, and imputed to him, that he may appear therein juſt, and ſo juſt in adminiſtration of righteouſneſs as not to infringe his Juſtice in the leaſt, but to the higheſt honor of the Law ſtanding in its full force againſt the ſinner, without the leaſt Relaxation. This is done quite contrary to the *Neonomian* Doctrine; therefore Gods Juſtification falling upon a Sinner, makes actually a correlate to Gods juſtifying, and faith is no more than the Sinners reception of this Grace; no part of that righteouſneſs by which faith or for which the Sinner is juſtified, neither is it a grain of that righteouſneſs which is imputed to him.

§. 9. Mr. *H.* alſo hath another diſtinction between *condition and duty*, which I will not ſtay upon becauſe its frivolous and it is becauſe he will have the duties of the Law to be performed by us, tho we be not juſtified by them, he inſiſts upon a Relaxation of the old Law but not a total Abolition, Mr. *Bax.* Opinion is that its abrogated as much as the Ceremonial Law, wherein both penalty and duty is taken away, and indeed Mr. *B.* is in the right according to his notion, for the introduction of a New Law in the room of it and for the ends that the old Law was eſtabliſht is certainly the nulling of the ſaid old Law, but how then can Mr. *B.* be ſecured from a juſt charge of *Antinomian viz.* that moral duties are not required of us, which is more *Antinomian* than I ever ſaw in any he chargeth with it, he hath one poor ſhift, which is that the duties of the old-Law are taken or ſpunged up in the conditions of the New; but however the broken pieces are pickt up, the Law it ſelf is gone, and there's no tranſgreſſion upon that account, Mr. *H.* ſaith the Law's only relaxed but his relaxation is no better than a Crack in the middle of a Glaſs and heart of it; and he hath not told us how far this relaxation goes, and every man will be ready to plead for his own ſin that the Law in that reſpect is relaxt. But he would have us believe, that the moral duties ſtill remain, how relaxt or not? if relaxt then at leaſt to an indifferency, a man may do them or not without any ſin; but he ſaith they

are

are re-established in the New-Law, if so they are re-established without the Relaxation and then the New-Law is as strict as the Old, or with the relaxation, and then all duties are required with abatement as to quality and quantity, with an allowance of sin, our *posse* or *velle*, and what is more *Antinomianism? But*, saith he, *the Conditions are not Duties*, It was never affirmed by men of reason, that the Condition of a Law is not a Duty; for that which is required of us upon pain of punishment is always a Duty, and to the Condition of the New-Law the highest, because it hath the Sanction of a Law of the Highest, he that continueth not in all things by way of performance that it requireth is cursed by it, if it be but imperfect obedience; it saith, he that continueth not in imperfect obedience is cursed by it, therefore when the Saints come to Heaven, and fall into perfect obedience they fall under the Curse of the new law, or else its out of doors before they come there, or the last day, and the World can't be judged by it. Lastly, What are the conditions of imperfect obedience? are they not Duties of Righteousness by the performance whereof Mr. *H.* will have us justified? Yes, this cannot be denied, but the distinction will hold with a *quatenus*, as they refer to the absolute, relaxed Laws they are Duties, *i. e.* as they respect no Law, or a lawless Law; and as they refer to the New Law they are Conditions and are not Duties. Hence its no Duty to perform the Conditions of the New Law for Justification thereby, and this is the Truth which we stand by, though infer'd truly from Mr. *H*'s Logick and Divinity.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

An Answer to Mr. H's Arguments against Imputation of Christs Righteousness.

Section 1. *Arguments Artificial or Inartificial.* §. 2. *His First Argument against the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness answered.* §. 3. *His Second Argument Answered.* §. 4. *His Third Argument Answered.* §. 5. *Mr.* H's *Argument for Faith and Obedience, being the formal part of Justification, First Answer.* §. 6. *The Assumption by parts.* §. 7. *Argument the Second Answered.* §. 8. *Mr.* H's *Third Argument Answered, with his Fourth Argument.* §. 9. *Of Constitutive Justification.*

Sect. 1. NOw it is time to come to Examine the grounds of Mr. *H.* and Mr. *C*'s Doctrine, in this Point of Justification. And *First*, I shall treat of them that are the reasoning Arguments, Artificial as called in Logick, the weakest in Divinity, and then those that are pretended from Scripture, which in Logick are called inartificial, but if grounded upon Divine Testimony, the best and strongest.

§. 2. Against the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, he argues thus. *How can God account our Sins to be Christs and his Righteousness ours when really they are not so, and Gods Judgment is according to Truth.*

Resp. this is used again and again by Mr. *B*, to which I shall Answer, 1. By retorting the Medium and not so tedious to put it into any other form, how can God account our own New Law righteousness to be justifying righteousness, when in its own nature its no righteousness (Mr. *H.* saith so over and over) and Gods judgment is according to Truth, now see the honesty of these Men, God must not make a Judgment according to Truth in imputing Christs perfect righteousness to us, because it was not personally performed by us, and imputing our Sins to Christ, because they were not actually committed by him, and yet God makes a judgment

ment according to Truth, in imputing our own paultry sinful righteousness to us for our righteousness, when they themselves say its really no righteousness. 2. Is not his righteousness ours? The Scripture saith it is, and our Sins made his; they say it doth not, that we will try, God willing, but for the present we ask what if God give us this Righteousness? What is freer than Gift? and what makes a better propriety than Free Gift? Is not Gods Judgment according to Truth, when he imputes that to us which he hath given? *Its the Gift of Righteousness, Rom. 5. E. gr.* A poor debtor is sued in Court for an 100 l. and upon Trial he is found insolvent, and Verdict is going to be given against him, the Judge throws him a Bag of 100l. in Court and bids him pay the debt, shall not the Court impute this to him a lawful Payment, and give him a discharge, and is not the Judgment according to Truth? on the other hand another hath the like Tryal, but is found insolvent, the Judge or some other gives him a Bag of Counters, and bids him to pay his Creditor, he refuseth the Money, saith its Brass; well saith the Judge we will impute it to him for a lawful tender and good Payment, we will make that which is no righteousness by our imputation to be a legal righteousness, so the Creditor may take the Bags of Counters and go shake his Ears, we call it good Money; now I appeal to these Men whether this be a Judgment according to Truth? And let them weigh it well and make application thereof, and if they can't make a rational reply, let them lay their Hands on their Mouth, and hold their peace for ever hereafter.

§. 3. A second great Argument taken from Mr. *B.* is, *That if it be so that Christs righteousness is imputed to us for Justification, then should the Elect be immediately freed from punishment, and immediately justified before they believed and repented, for no Terms could be Imposed on them in order to their Justification and Glory, if they be accounted already to have fulfilled the Law of Christ.* And this is one (*as he saith*) of the *Antinomian* consequences.

Resp. Let it be so, we say then. *First*, If it be an *Antinomian* consequence, what is the reason Mr. *B.* and Mr. *H.* are such *Antinomians*, to say all the World are pardoned before Faith and Repentance, yea, whether they believe or no? Why doth Mr. *B.* assert two Justifications before Faith? 2. We reckon it no *Antinomianism* to say, that Election perfectly freed the Elect from coming under the execution of the Vindictive Wrath of God and Curse of the Law: Why else should the Scripture say, *who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect?* and whereas it may be said before Conversion, the Law will charge, for they are under the Law, its replied, *its Christ that died, yea rather is risen*, having fully satisfied the Law

Law of God, that they shall not fall under the Execution of the Curse of it, and they are secured before God both by Election and Redemption, or else Christ died and rose again in vain; and as they have this security, so they have an immediate right in Christ to the Life of Grace and Glory; They want the application and the receiving of this righteousness, and a possession thereof, which reception is by Faith that is not their own, but purchased and given by Christ; which was never purchased and given for their righteousness, but as an Organ of Spiritual Life, whereby a Man created in Christ Jesus may be sensible, and have the comfort of what is freely given to him of God; for by Faith a Man takes up the Peace which Christ hath made, and hath access into the justifying Grace of God wherein he stands, and therefore comes from under the Law in his own Conscience, and rejoiceth in the hope of the glory of God. 3. As for imposing of Terms, its Idle, to think that Christ should do what he did for Sinners in his Prieftly Office, their Justification, and Salvation, and then to impose an impossibility upon them, without the performance of which all that he hath done should be nothing to them; and do Men talk Sence when they talk of imposing Terms upon Sinners for Eternal Life, the Terms should be put upon them to be performed before they have Spiritual Life in their meer natural Estate, and then to make their notion to stand on its right bottom; they must be *Pelagians*, its Eternal Life that is begun in Justification applied to the Believer and his Person by the Spirit, and its received Vitally and Sensibly by Faith, when the Sinner is made a live by the Sanctifying work of the Spirit, his Life of Faith is part of the Eternal Life purchased: Can any Terms of Life be imposed on a dead Man, what Terms were imposed upon *Lazarus*; if the roling away the Grave-Stone was the Term, it was not imposed on him, it was on them that stood about the Grave, if they say God will give these Terms, as they must say to save themselves from *Pelagianism*, then the Term lies upon God, and its Idle to say they are imposed upon incapable Subjects, neither is that Imposed upon me as a Term that cannot be expected from me, unless by the donation of another, by any rational Man. 4. The clause follows not according to Mr. *H.*'s Principles, who saith Christ satisfied the Law (tho I know what the *Neonomians* talk of, they intend no true satisfaction) did Christ satisfie the Law in what Sence they will? Was it for himself or for us? if for himself, then he offended it, this they will not say, then for us; if for us, our Offence was taken of before God, thereby God was in him by reason of his satisfaction not imputing our Trespasses; how can it be otherwise but we must be accounted by God to have fulfilled the Law in Christ, if Gods

Gods judgment be according to Truth, and why may not this ſatisfaction be, and our fulfilling in Chriſt be before we had a being in the World? this was actually performed for the Saints before his coming, long after moſt of them were dead, why not for thoſe that are to come before they have life? and why may they not be called to a fellowſhip with Chriſt, and participation of the righteouſneſs of Chriſt in Satisfaction by Faith? when the day of their Regeneration comes. This is the dangerous Doctrine that theſe poor blind men are ſo afraid of.

§. 4. There is another Argument of Mr. *H*'s. which he takes to be *Herculean*, and admires, and it looks as if it were out of his own Forge and he chargeth Mr. *L.* to hearken to it. *Animadv. p.67. There is nothing can be imputed to us, but either that which we have not, and then it is that we may have it, that is, to have it made ours, or reputed as ours.*

Reſp. There is nothing can be imputed to a Sinner for righteouſneſs but that which he hath not firſt, but is given (ſo ſaith Mr. *H.*) and here's the difference, he ſaith, inherent Grace is given for righteouſneſs, we ſay, the obedience of Chriſt is given for our righteouſneſs, which the Scripture ſaith; now it is given that it may be imputed ours legally, and its imputed that we may be juſtified; it is not imputed that we may have it, but becauſe we have it it is imputed; Mr. *H.* herein goes againſt himſelf.

Or elſe if we have it, it muſt be imputed to ſome other end than to have it. Anſw. Yes, its imputed legally that we may be juſtified; we have it by gift, *prius natura*, by gift of Grace, for we muſt have the righteouſneſs before the Law can judge we have it, becauſe legal Judgment is according to Truth. Mr. *H*'s Juſtification runs thus far, that we muſt have a righteouſneſs before it is imputed, nay, and he ſaith its by Gift too. *Now if Chriſt did obey or ſuffer in our perſons, or as our legal perſon, ſo as in law ſence we have, and are accounted to have obeyed and ſuffered in him, then can his righteouſneſs (conſiſting of his Obedience and Sufferings) be neither imputed to us that we may have it, or be made ours, or reckoned to us as ours, ſeeing we have it already; it is ours, it is reckoned as ours, in that it was performed in our perſons; nor can it be imputed to us to any other end, or thing, but* ad juſtitiam, *which is to the ſame end, and for the ſame thing, and can be no other.*

Reſp. Mr. *H.* thinks this Argument irrefrigable, and that it will carry all before it, but poor men (as moſt oppoſers of truth) have the unhappineſs to ſmite with the backs of their Swords, and cut themſelves with the edge. Mr. *H.* argues, if we have Chriſt's righteouſneſs, we cannot have it by Imputation.

We do not ſay we have it by imputation any other than a le-

gal allowance that we have it, having it is antecedent to the legal allowance, it is not so in their Principles? *we have our own righteousness before it is imputed to us.* But if in a law-sence we are accounted to have obeyed and suffered in Christ, then his righteousness cannot be imputed unto us, *cujus contrarium verum*, yea, therefore its imputed unto us, for one man's payment is not reckoned and imputed to another, unless the payment be made in his person in a law-sence; it is ours, and reckoned as ours in that it was performed in our persons, he saith, therefore as such it is reckoned and imputed to us, nor can it be imputed to us for any other end than *for righteousness*, we say and you say.

§. 5. Mr. *H*'s Arguments for Faith and Obedience being the Formal Cause of our Justification, we shall examine in the next place, they are, as Mr. *Cl.* hath gathered them up, *By the consent of all Divines, That righteousness which denominates us righteous in the sight of God, must be the form or formal part of our Justification; But neither Regeneration, nor Christ's Righteousness, nor Pardon is that which justifies per modum causæ formalis, and therefore it must be Faith. Resp.* 1. He should have added *imputed*, to the things enumerated in the *minor*; for he saith to Mr. *C.* he means so. 2. If he doth mean so, he putteth the material and formal cause together, and therefore I shall deny his Minor under the term of essential causes, which takes in his formal: As to the *major* I except, that all the Divines do not hold that righteousness that denominates us righteous before God is the formal cause, but insist on the *minors* denial, that the righteousness of Christ doth not denominate us righteous before God, for so should the *assumption* be; the *Syllogism* as it stands is false, having one medium in *Major*, another in the *Minor*. Dare Mr. *H.* be so scandalous as to speak out his *Minor* as he ought by his *Medium*, That Christ's Righteousness doth not denominate us righteous in the sight of God, its plain that he shifts it off by a wrong Assumption, and according to that fault makes his Proof. And I only say, that there's no righteousness can denominate us righteous in the sight of God, but what is fully satisfactory to the Law that condemns us; but there's no righteousness fully satisfactory to the Law that condemns us, but Christ's. let Mr. *H.* shew any other if he can; and as for the righteousness of the New Law which he pleads for, he acknowledgeth that its no righteousness in its own nature, that it needs Pardon at the Bar of the Old Law, and therefore it cannot denominate us righteous in the sight of God.

§. 6. He proceeds to prove his false Assumption by parts. 1. That Christ's righteousness is not that righteousness whereby we are denominated righteous in the sight of God: why? because

cauſe ſaith he, it is the meritorious caſe: I anſwer, therefore it is, for no righteouſneſs makes any one righteous *coram Judice*, but a meritorious righteouſneſs, *not regenerating grace*; ſee how he ſhifts, he ſaid in his *Minor*, *not regeneration*, *i. e. inherent renovation*; which he all along aſſerts for our juſtifying righteouſneſs; and now he has brought it to the active infuſion of Grace, as he quibbles with the *Papiſts*, and why not Regenerating Grace? becauſe that muſt precede Juſtification, and muſt not the righteouſneſs precede the Juſtification by his own Doctrine? and doth not the *formalis ratio* precede the effect; but what doth regenerating Grace preceed? Is it not regeneration it ſelf, it being the working cauſe of it, but as for the Grace of regeneration wrought, that's the very righteouſneſs which he means, and yet ſaith in his *Aſſumption* not regeneration, this is but juggling, it is not plain dealing. *He goes on*, not pardon for that comes after it, Mr. *H.* ſaith ſo I know no better authority for it, and I will believe it *ad Græcas calendas*, I have ſhewed the abſurdity and folly of it, yea, and of his pardon preceeding Juſtification. *And if none of theſe be the formal cauſe*, i. e. *the Eſſential cauſes denominating us Righteous in Gods ſight, it muſt be ſomething elſe*: What's that? The righteouſneſs of God revealed in the Goſpel, *i. e.* Faith and Obedience. Mr. *Cl.* ſaith ſomething elſe. Imputation, its that which is the form, one eſſential cauſe, in this they differ, but as to the matter they agree; that Faith and imperfect Obedience, is the righteouſneſs whereby we are denominated righteous in the ſight of God, and is not the Grace of regeneration inherent; whether Faith be the righteouſneſs of God ſhall be examined anon by its ſelf, becauſe Mr. *H.* puts ſo much ſtreſs upon it.

§. 7. Arg. 2. *Adam if he had perfectly obeyed, his Obedience had been his formal Righteouſneſs in regard to the Law, ſo is this ours in regard to the Goſpel. Again, works were the formal righteouſneſs in regard to the Law, therefore Faith is the formal righteouſneſs of Juſtification by the Goſpel. And two things go to this formal Righteouſneſs, Faith and the imputation of it.*

Reſp. It ſeems Mr. *H.* underſtands formal cauſe, matter formed, and that is an effect not a cauſe, the *materia formata*, is the formal cauſe; I muſt tell him his Notion is neither Divinity nor Logick. 2. What conſequence is there in this Argument, works were the formal cauſe of Juſtification as to the Law of Works, therefore works muſt be the formal cauſe in relation to the Goſpel, it follows not but *vice verſa*, and if the conſequence be true, then there's no formal difference between Law and Goſpel. 3. Hereby he yields that New Law conditions, are Old Law works, and conſequently his Goſpel is no Goſpel, but a Law of works

which is contrary to Scripture, and accordingly Mr. *Cl.* saith, Gospel works must merit the reward, as works should have done in *Adams* Covenant; Mr. *H*'s reply is so weak, that its not worth taking Notice of.

§. 3. *Argum.* 1. *Justification hath a form, and that must be some righteousness. Resp.* It may have a form, and yet Righteousness be the matter. What righteousness is it whereby we are justified? I answer against Mr. *Cl.* and him, that its no righteousness inherent in the justification of a sinner: He saith, *its not regenerating grace infused, but imputed. Answer.* What makes the difference then between Sanctification and Justification? its nothing but the divers respect in Mr. *H*'s. Divinity, and wherein lies that respect, is it not in imputation? and this Logick he yields in his Notes,

Argument 4. *Divines generally fix it upon some righteousness.*

Resp. If some Divines speak improperly, it doth not justifie Mr. *H.* to do so; but he saith, *a distinction is made of a* genus *and* differentia, *and therefore righteousness must be the form.*

Resp. Non sequitur, for *genus* is the matter, and but part of the form at most sometimes, but the differencing part of the Definition is the form distinct from the *genus.* Mr. *Cl.* saith, *the most plausible Argument of all* (because it is Scripture) *you have omitted, we are justified by faith.* This, saith Mr. *H.* is my *id per quod* that runs through all my Books, its true, and what would Mr. *H.* have done to support his Notion, if the Cardinal had not helpt him to this *id per quod*, and *id propter quod*, he takes himself safe enough between the Cardinal and Bishops. Well, Mr. *Cl.* is not so well pleased, I find, with his *formalis causa*, but rather than break with Mr. *H.* he will comport with him; especially finding him very uncertain and unsettled, sometimes our righteousness is the formal cause, and sometimes the material, and imputation the formal. Mr. *Cl.* hath another denomination for our own righteousness, he calls it *our subordinate righteousness*: Our Justification by Faith, or accounting it to us for righteousness. will be considered anon.

§. *Cl.* also gathering and applauding Mr. *H*'s. constitutive Justification, let it be a little inspected, Mr. *Cl.* saith, *That Mr. H. doth clearly distinguish his Opinion from the* Papists *in that he makes infused righteousness only Sanctification, and imputation of the same to be Justification*; its only to distinguish up our own righteousness several ways: I would ask these Gentlemen whether they do not hold the infusion of their righteousness, and Justification upon it imputed; if they do, so do the *Papist*; for if the *Papist* did hold making a man's righteousness inherent to be Justification, then must they hold some merit of condignity to precede in the

the natural man; for a meer free gift as ſuch, is an infuſion, cannot be Juſtification. I do not ſee but Mr. *H*'s conſtitutive Juſtification and the *Papiſts* is all one; for if they ſay, God infuſeth righteouſneſs, and imputeth righteouſneſs, its the ſame thing, and God cannot conſtitute any juſt by infuſion but he muſt impute him ſo. I have ſaid this conſtitutive Juſtification, as they take it, can be no other than Imputation if they will make it differ from declarative Juſtification. 2. *The conſtituting us as juſt doth in order of nature go before accounting or uſing us as juſt.*

Reſp. God neither conſtitutes any man juſt in and by his own righteouſneſs, nor accounts them ſo; But we can ſay, God firſt gives us Chriſt's righteouſneſs by his Grace, then accounts us righteous therein, *Conſtitutive Juſtification conſiſts in three things, in making us juſt, accounting us juſt, and uſing us as juſt*, all theſe the *Papiſts* have, *Therefore more fully, Juſtification is a judicial act, and that by the law of Grace, God by that Law, and the act of God's law, makes, pronounces, and by pronouncing makes a Believer a righteous perſon, and being ſo made, accounts him ſo.* *Reſp.* The Scripture ſpeaks of Juſtification of a Sinner, and therefore ſaith, *its an act of free Grace*, Indeed Mr. *H*'s. Juſtification can be no other than a judicial Act, its no way conſiſtent with Grace, becauſe he ſaith its by a Law and Act of it, whereby it makes and pronounceth a believer righteous, and it ſeems he is firſt declaratively juſtified, and after imputed righteous, when God hath pronounced him righteous, then accounts him ſo, Ὕστερον πρότερον, the Cart before the Horſe. *Our righteouſneſs wrought in us by Vocation, and is the ſame materially, but not formally, with this righteouſneſs of Juſtification.*

Reſp. Now here's the reaſon why he ſticks ſo hard for our righteouſneſs, being the formal part of our Juſtification, ſo that the ſame righteouſneſs (as he ſaith materially the ſame) Sanctifies us materially, and Juſtifies us formally. So as that, as Sanctifying it hath no form, and as Juſtifying no matter. Now this is a *Quatenus* with a witneſs, ſo in Mr. *Cl*'s ſence he doth well, making the matter real, and the form relative. Theſe things Mr. *H.* in his ſeveral middle-way Pages, and Letters repeats a hundred times, you cannot look into a Page hardly, but you have the ſum of his Doctrine; therefore it muſt not be expected that I ſhould follow him Page by Page, unleſs I ſhould Tautologize as he doth.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Whether Faith be our justifying Righteousness.

Section 1. *Whether the Saints before Christs did not look upon themselves as righteous by their own righteousness.* §. 2. Abraham *considered.* §. 3. Abraham *considered.* §. 4. Abraham's *Justification further considered.* §. 5 *Of Subordinate righteousness.* §. 6. *Mr.* Cl's. *defence of a Subordinate righteousness.* §. 7 *Opposition of Faith and Works in Justification, Mr.* Cl's 2*d. and* 3*d. Arg.* §. 8. *Mr.* Cl. *fourth Argument Answer'd.* §. 9. *Argument* 5, 6. §. 10. *More to Mr.* H's *challenge.*

Sect. 1. MR. *H*'s. Enquiry about the Saints before Christs coming is, *He would know of any Man who is most Orthodox in his Complexion, whether he does or is able to think that* Enoch, Noah, Job, *who were before the Law,* Samuel, *the Kings and Prophets under the Law, or any Man or Woman whatsoever before the coming of Christ, did ever imagine that they were righteous or accepted with God for the Obedience which the* Messiah *should perform on their behalf when he came into the World, and believing this was an Instrument of making him to be theirs* &c. *And whether they did not look upon themselves righteous by their own righteousness, their doing righteousness, and to obtain favour by their upright walking, and no otherwise in the World?*

Resp. If Mr. *H.* means Men of the Orthodox complexion in his Eye, *Neonomian* complexions, I believe but few, if any for ought I know but are of the Opinion Mr. *B.* hath declared himself, and divers others of that Orthodoxy; but if he means the true *Protestant* Calviniſtical complexion, there's enough of them. 2. I would know whether or no they did ever hear of a New Law, and if they expected to be justified by their own righteousness, or whether they thought of any other Law to be justified by, than the Law of Works? For there was not the least Word of any other Law before the Flood or after, none can be pretended to be, till *Abrahams* time at furtheſt. 3. Whether there was one Word of a conditinal promiſe to *Adam* after the fall, and whether he thinks not that *Adam*, *Abel*,

Abel, *Enoch*, &c. Were not ſaved by Faith in that abſolute promiſe that the ſeed of the Woman, &c. (who is the Meſſiah tho' not under the Name of Meſſiah till Ages afterwards) did they not believe in his righteouſneſs, as that which ſhould break the Serpents Heads, *i. e.* all the power he had got over Man by the unrighteouſneſs he had brought him into? 4. If they did look upon themſelves as righteous without the Obedience of the Meſſiah (or by the Name which the Spirit of God reveal'd him to them) why did they offer Sacrifice for Sin, did they look at no Significancy or typicalneſs in them, were they not taught of God ſo to do, and did he not ſhew ſhew them that they were typical of the great Sacrifice the ſeed of the Woman ſhould offer in the end of the World? Was it not by Faith they offered them, *Heb.* 11. And what was that Faith, was it not in a righteouſneſs? for *Noah* believed in a righteouſneſs and became heir of righteouſneſs which is by Faith, what was he Heir of his own Righteouſneſs? did they believe in themſelves? *The* Apoſtle's *deſign is not to prove that Faith is the Evidence of things not ſeen, the Subſtance of thoſe things hoped for*, that thoſe worthys lived in Faith and Hope, and dyed ſo not having received the promiſe in performance, but ſaluted and embraced it by Faith. 5. Had *Job* and his friends ſuch Principles (tho' not of the *Jews* Church) *chap.* 19. 27. *I know that my Redeemer liveth*, was there no Faith in his Words, is there no righteouſneſs in a Redeemer? and what were the Sentiments of his Friends in this Doctrine, ſure they were not *Neonomians*, Job 25. 4. *How can Man be juſtified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a Woman?* Saith *Bildad*. A *Neonomian* would have eaſily reſolved this Queſtion, by performing of the conditions of the New-Law; but alas they heard not of this New-Law, this Nor-Weſt paſſage to Heaven.

§. 2. Let us conſider *Abraham*, whether he did imagine himſelf righteous, by his doing righteouſly, or looked to obtain favour of God thereby, and no otherways, and whether his Faith was not Eminently carried forth to the Eying of Chriſt in the promiſe. Chriſt ſaith, *Abraham rejoiced to ſee my Day, and ſaw it and was glad*, he ſaw it, and ſaw it, and rejoiced and was glad, *John* 8. 58. And where and how did he ſee it? was it not in the promiſe of his Seed? and what did he ſee in it? was it not the bleſſedneſs promiſed? *Gen.* 12. and the Salvation by Redemption and Righteouſneſs, did he ſee nothing in Chriſt for his own Soul; yes, you ſay he ſaw him as a *Neonomian* Cypher, to ſtand by his Juſtification by his own Works, to the magnifying his own righteouſneſs, but the Spirit of God ſaith he was not juſtified by Works; how come Men to ſay he was? *James* ſaith he was, how, by approving the

Truth of his Faith, for he was in a juſtifyed State long before the offering up his Son, but his Faith was proved, and approved of by God, and witneſſed to, by this eminent Act of Obedience. God teſtified to his particular Acts of Obedience, which the World was ready to Condemn, and ſo to *Rahab*, ſo to *Phineas* his Act, that whatever the World judged of theſe Actions, yet they were approved of God as righteous, and true Obedience: *Abel* was an accepted perſon of God before his offering, then becauſe his perſon was juſtified, God witneſſeth to his gifts, that they were accepted as being done in Faith; whereas *Cain* was an unjuſtified perſon, theres no Sinner juſtified by his Works, but a Believers Works are accepted, becauſe their perſons are accepted in another righteouſneſs, in which their Works are accepted afterward: *Abel* was firſt accepted, and then his Service.

§. 3. Now we are upon *Abraham*, let us conſider him a little further, did he imagine himſelf righteous without the Obedience of Chriſt, and no other way than by his own righteouſneſs? What do theſe Men make of the Goſpel preached, is it not the preaching of Chriſt for righteouſneſs, for Chriſt is made Righteouſneſs to us, 1 *Cor.* 1. The Goſpel was preached to *Abraham*; what was that? The *Apoſtle* tells us, *Gal.* 3. 8. It was in the firſt promiſe whereby he was converted to God in *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, *Gen.* 12. In thee ſhall all the Nations of the Earth be bleſſed, and that this contained in it, that bleſſing of righteouſneſs which is after more particularly Explained, he was juſtified as the *Heathen*, and believing *Gentiles* were to be juſtified afterwards, and the *Apoſtle* ſaith theſe that are ἐκ πίστεως, *i. e.* of that kind of Juſtification, are bleſſed with faithful *Abraham*, *ver.* 9. but ſuch as are ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, that expect juſtification from the Works of a Law are under a curſe, for the Law *i. e.* Juſtification by the works of the Law is not of juſtifying Faith, theirs none under *Abraham*'s bleſſing, expect Juſtification by the Works of the Law. Indeed the Myſtery was not ſo diſtinctly underſtood, *Eph.* 3. 5. Yet they were ſaved even as we, *Acts* 15. And how are we *Gentiles* ſaved? by becoming fellow Heirs of the ſame Body (*i. e.* myſtical) and partakers of his promiſe in Chriſt by the Goſpel, *Eph.* 3. 6. The which participation the faithful before Chriſt was, the Goſpel had preached to *Abraham*.

§. 4. The great cry is that Faith, *i. e.* our working Faith, our Faith and Obedience is our Subordinate Righteouſneſs, or co-ordinate or Supream, which our *Neonomians* pleaſe, for Juſtification, becauſe it is ſaid *Abrahams Faith was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs*, i. e. ſay they his Goſpel Works, not *Moſaical*, or not according to the Old Law, but according to the New.

This

This aſſertion is moſt falſe, for theſe reaſons. 1. There was no *Moſaical* Law in *Abraham*'s days. 2. There was no New Law exhibited to *Abraham*, for their promiſe was abſolute, *Gen.* 12. And cannot be pretended to be conditional. 3. Its not conſiſtent with the nature of Faith, which is the Evidence of ſomething not ſeen, or preſent, but Works and Faith as ſuch is both ſeen in us, and preſent with us. 4. If Faith be the very righteouſneſs, then Faith believes in Faith as righteouſneſs. Doth the Scripture bid us believe in our ſelves, or believe in another. Faith believes in Faith, for our very righteouſneſs by theſe Men, which is moſt abſurd, when they preach, they ſhould bid Men believe in themſelves, did *Abraham* believe in his Faith? Was that his believing, or did he believe that which was held out in the Promiſe? the ſame thing that God imputes to us for righteouſneſs, we do make the Object of our Faith for Righteouſneſs. Now then if God imputes our believing to us, then we believe in our believing, theſe are inevitable Rocks this Doctrine will bring theſe Men unto. 5. God cannot impute Faith as a Work, and in the *Neonomian* ſence for righteouſneſs, it being as Mr. *H.* confeſſeth again and again, *no righteouſneſs, ſinful, in need of* pardon, for, 1. This would not be according to truth to call evil good, nor to do it in a way of adminiſtration of Juſtice, as in Juſtification, would it be juſt? But moſt unjuſt, God is a God of Truth and Holineſs, and the Judge of all the World, and therefore muſt deal righteouſly, for tho' he pardons Iniquity, yet will by no means clear the Guilty. 2. Its contrary to their own aſſertions, that Juſtification is an Act of Juſtice, whereas ſuch an Imputation and Juſtification as they ſpeak of, would be far from an Act of juſtice, and is a meer diſpenſation with juſtice, for where a Law muſt be abrogated, or relaxed, there is an abſolute diſpenſation with Juſtice, and without one of theſe they confeſs there cannot be Juſtification by their New Law. 6. This cannot be juſtification, becauſe Sin is not pardoned in it, nor the perſon accepted, Imputation of righteouſneſs to the work, before its to the perſon, and if the perſon muſt do good works before he's juſtifi'd, which is abſurd, becauſe the works he doth are imputed to him, and he is juſtified by 'em, as they ſay.

§. 5. But let us hear what Mr. *Cl.* hath to ſay for the Proof of this Poſition, that Faith is our Subordinate righteouſneſs (*i. e.* in his ſence an interveening righteouſneſs coming between Chriſts righteouſneſs) whereby we are juſtified before we come at Chriſt, or pardon, both being conſequent to our Juſtification, by this New-Law-Righteouſneſs which he calls Faith, ſee, p. 64. His reaſon are theſe, 1. *What elſe can be the plain and proper meaning of that Phraſe, it was accounted to him for righteouſneſs? (Without putting*

ting it upon the Rack of Tropes and Figures, and the like Engines of Cruelty, &c.

Resp. Doth Mr. *Cl.* pretend to be an interpreter of Scripture, and will not allow the use of a Trope or Figure, but to call them Engines of Cruelty, is to say, where a Trope is said to be used in a Scripture, there is a wresting of Scripture; I must tell him that a Tropical sence of many Places of Scripture, is the true plain and proper sence and meaning of the Spirit of God, in many most eminent Expressions, and for this he must expect to be watched in the adjusting his New-found righteousness, whether he doth no where interpret Scripture Tropically. What answer will he give the *Papist* in the Doctrin of Transubstantiation founded on, *This is my Body*? Mr. *B.* saith, its as credible as the Doctrine of imputation of Christs Righteousness: And what saith Mr. *Cl.* to the Covenant of Circumcision. Well let us make a little Impartial Examination of this Expression, *If Abraham were justified by works*, Rom. 4. 2. *he hath boasting, but not before God*; not in the Presence of God for his Justification, yea he may rejoice, that through Grace he hath performed any action by faith which God witnesseth to, as *James* speaks of, but he dare not plead it before God for Justification of his Person. Now he brings in Justification by Faith in diametrical opposition to it; for the Scripture saith, *Abraham believed in God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness*, so translated, the words in the *Hebrew* may run thus. *He believed on Jehovah, and he accounted it* (*i. e.* what he believed of him) *for righteousness to him*, the Words are rendred by the *Septuagint* and the New Testament. *Abraham believed God, it was accounted to be unto righteousness.* The Seed promised before was the thing believed by *Abraham*, the *blessing unto all Nations*, which Seed was to proceed from his and *Sarah* his Wife's Loins, this was the promise of God to him, and *this was accounted to him for righteousness*; he believed Jehovah graciously promising, and the thing promised, Jehovah imputed to him for righteousness וַתֶּחְשְׁבֶהָ he accounted the thing believed, not the Faith it self, therefore the *Targum* hath its בְּמֵימְרֵיהּ *he believed the word of promise, and the thing promised was imputed to him*; in this sense the Apostle takes it, *Rom.* 4. 3. *Gal.* 3. 6. where in both places he opposeth a righteousness of faith, *i. e.* which is believed on, unto a righteousness within which is no object of faith, for it is within us, and an object of sense, he believed God in the Promise of Christ, and this that he believed was reckoned to him; he argues presently that this imputation was not to *Abraham* as a work of any kind, for *to him that worketh* (as much as if he should say, O do not mistake me, I do not, nor doth the Scripture speak of *Abraham*'s Faith as a work)

a work) *the reward ſhould not be of grace but debt, but to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that juſtifieth the ungodly.* (as *Abraham* was when firſt juſtified, *Joſh.* 24.) *his faith is eſteemed to be unto* δικαιοσυνην, *i. e.* he believes upon the righteouſneſs which is imputed to him. And why may not Faith be taken objectively, by a Metonomy, for the thing believed? for 'tis not unuſual in Scripture, Chriſt is ſaid *to be our hope*, the *object of our hope*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 1. and ſo *the hope laid up for us in Heaven*, i. e. *the things hoped for*, *Coloſſ.* 1. 5. ſo *looking for that bleſſed hope*, *Tit.* 2. 14. *the things hoped for*; what's more frequent than theſe Metonomies, yea proper, plain and elegant; in matters of ſenſe or perception its moſt frequent to put the object for the ſence, and ſence for the object, *Matth.* 6. 22. *the light of the body is the eye*, and there the light is for the eye, and after, the eye for the light; beſides, its a rule, that when a word in Scripture taken in the direct ſenſe, will croſs other Scriptures, and the ſignification lies fair for the Analogy of Faith, then the true ſenſe lies in the Trope; as here, *we are juſtified by faith*, but how? as it lays hold on the juſtifying blood of Chriſt, or elſe we contradict, *Rom.* 5. 9. *being now juſtified by his blood*; now either Faith or the juſtifying Blood of Chriſt muſt fall into a Trope; for which is it fitteſt, and to which doth it ſuit beſt? *Paul Rom.* 4. argues ſtrenuoully againſt juſtification by works, and therefore, againſt Juſtification by Faith as a Work. To this kind of Juſtification he oppoſeth that of Faith, its being accounted for righteouſneſs; if faith be underſtood as a work of righteouſneſs, then the Apoſtle contradicts himſelf, and maketh juſtification by faith to be juſtification by works. and ſo diſputes vainly, making no oppoſition; but if in Juſtification by Faith the righteouſneſs is imputed to us, and that be the driſt of it, then his Argumentation hath the greateſt weight, the righteouſneſs of Faith is Chriſt's righteouſneſs, and the righteouſneſs of works our righteouſneſs inherent, wrought by us, or in us, utterly excluded from Juſtification.

§. 6. Mr. *Cl*'s Second Argument, *Becauſe the Apoſtle frequently oppoſeth* working and believing, faith and works, *Works as a perfect obedience to the Law, Faith as a ſincere obedience to the Goſpel.*

Reſp. Then the Apoſtle ſhould have oppoſed *works and works*, and diſtinguiſhed between *Law-works* and *Goſpel works*; or when he had oppoſed Faith unto Works in two Epiſtles ſo largely, he ſhould have excepted Goſpel-works, or ſaid, I do not mean Faith as a work; but to be ſhort, for I ſhall not need to be long on the remaining Arguments: We ſay only, that this Argument is againſt Mr. *Cl.* becauſe the Apoſtle ſtill makes ſo clear an oppoſition

poſition betwixt Faith and Works without any Exception.

Arg. 3. *It is expreſly called the righteouſneſs of faith*, Rom. 4. 11, 13. *chap.* 9. 30. *chap.* 10. 16. *by faith*, *Gal.* 5. 5. *Heb.* 11. 5.

Reſp. This affects us not, The righteouſneſs of faith, is but as the light of the eye, the righteouſneſs which is the object of faith, *Rom.* 4. 11. *he received the ſign of circumciſion*, called the covenant of Circumciſion by a plain Trope, not cruel at all, *the ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith*: Is this a Seal only that we are righteous, or is it a Seal of the righteouſneſs of Chriſt promiſed to *Abraham*, *v.* 13. there's a poſitive denial that the Promiſe was to *Abraham* and his Seed through a Law, any Law, Old or New, but thro the righteouſneſs of faith the proper and peculiar object in Juſtification, *Rom.* 9. 30. the righteouſneſs of Faith is oppoſed to the righteouſneſs of Works the *Jews* depended on. By Faith, is but righteouſneſs received by Faith, or waited for in faith, *Gal.* 5. 5. *we by the Spirit* (*i. e.* its aſſiſtance) *wait for the hope of righteouſneſs*) (*i. e.* the righteouſneſs hoped for) *by faith*, or *from faith*, ἐκ πίστεως, its not called *the righteouſneſs of faith* there; to what purpoſe quoted, I know not, and *Heb.* 11. 5. where it is ſaid, *by faith Enoch was tranſlated*, what's *Enoch*'s Tranſlation here to his Juſtification which was three hundred years before?

§. 7. *Argument* 4. *Becauſe Faith is a conformity to the rule of the promiſe* (*wherein the nature of righteouſneſs doth conſiſt*) *viz. the Goſpel or Covenant of Grace, which requires only ſincere believing, not perfect doing*, Rom. 10. 8. 10. *and therefore tho it be not righteouſneſs in ſtrict Juſtice, according to the law of nature* (*i. e.* works) *yet it is righteouſneſs according to the favourable conſtruction of the Goſpel, i. e. God upon the account of Chriſt's righteouſneſs is pleaſed to accept of this for righteouſneſs, ſo as to account it, whence its called the righteouſneſs of God.*

Reſp. The *rule of the promiſe* is an uncouth Term which I have examined elſewhere, and therefore ſhall not now ſtand upon it, only, *A rule of the promiſe* muſt be either by which it is made, or upon which it is performed; there's no Rule God makes any Promiſe by, but his own good Will and Pleaſure; but its the Rule its performed by that muſt be a Rule in us, by which God walks, *i. e.* the condition of the New Law performed by us, a Law indeed hath ſuch a Rule, but no Goſpel hath; *do and live*, *do* is the Rule, and *live* the Promiſe. to be performed upon our doing; and this is theſe mens Goſpel or Govenant of Grace, a downright Law; and where is it proved that Faith is a conformity to this Rule of the Promiſe, or legal Condition? *Rom.* 10. 8. there's ſomething ſaid of a believing the Word preached, but what's that to the Rule of the Promiſe, and *verſe* 10. *with the heart*

heart man believes unto righteouſneſs, &c. who denies Faith, if it be true to be as ſincere as any other Grace, but this proves it not to be our righteouſneſs; the words of the Text are againſt it, it believes unto righteouſneſs, it goes out of it ſelf for righteouſneſs, takes not its ſelf for righteouſneſs, *v.* 11. the object, *believed on*, where this righteouſneſs is, is told *v.* 11 *whoſoever believeth on him*, but theſe men will have believing unto righteouſneſs, to be faith believing it ſelf unto righteouſneſs. VVell, when Faith hath done its do to make its ſelf righteouſneſs, yet it is not righteouſneſs in the ſenſe of the law of works which is the true Rule of a Law-righteouſneſs that God never abates in the leaſt of) yet it is Goſpel-righteouſneſs, according to the favourable conſtruction of the Goſpel; God forbid that that ſhould be our juſtifying-righteouſneſs, which ſtrict Juſtice will not allow to be righteouſneſs: Here they bring in God's diſpenſing with Juſtice, and make him a favourer of unrighteouſneſs, in making it ſuch for Juſtification; this is *Antinomianiſm* with a witneſs, for God to favour ſin, and juſtifie him for that which a juſt Law and ſtrict Juſtice condemns for unrighteouſneſs; the righteouſneſs of the new Law is condemn'd at the Bar of the old law; hence it can be no better than the law of Sin and Death, and yet this unrighteous condition muſt be father'd on God's favourable conſtruction, yea, on Jeſus Chriſts Undertaking and Performance; he undertook and died for this end, that our unrighteouſneſs ſhould have the honour of juſtifying us, his was but ſubſervient to that end; it ſeems God would have it ſo, that his Son ſhould be made a Sacrifice to purchace the imputation of our own righteouſneſs, *for righteouſneſs unto juſtification*, and therefore it is called the *righteouſneſs of God*, why, becauſe its ours and not Chriſts: Of this in another place.

§. 8. *That Faith is our Goſpel-righteouſneſs appears further from Rom.* 10. this being the ſame with the Fourth, and anſwered there, I need ſay nothing to it.

Argument 6. *There are but two ſorts of righteouſneſs, Legal and Evangelical, but this is not legal righteouſneſs, and therefore it muſt be Evangelical.*

Reſp. There is but one ſort of righteouſneſs, and that is legal, and its a legal righteouſneſs though graciouſly beſtowed, that we are juſtified by, and its impoſſible that it ſhould be otherwiſe; its only the legal righteouſneſs of Chriſt made ours, which is our Evangelical, Chriſt's own righteouſneſs, as it reſpects the Juſtice of God and his Law, is Legal; as it reſpects a Sinner, is graciouſly beſtowed, its Evangelical. But alas, Mr. *Cl.* to prevent miſconſtruction, after he hath bin diſputing for the work of Faith to be our righteouſneſs, *yet we muſt not expect Mercy, Juſtifica-*

tion,

tion, Pardon, Reconciliation or Favour with God, upon the account of our ſincerity, Faith or Obedience, as the procuring cauſe; but we are to look up to Chriſt, confeſſing our beſt works to be but filthy rags in ſtrict juſtice, &c.

Reſp. One may ſee how frail a righteouſneſs theſe men have feigned to themſelves; it is as the Spider's Web that they dare not lean upon it, tho they will ſwagger and vapour with it to out-dare them whom they call *Antinomians*, who will cleave immediately to Chriſt's righteouſneſs alone as their only righteouſneſs without the intervention of theſe filthy Rags; their righteouſneſs muſt have Chriſt ſtand behind the Curtain to patch their ragged raiment; their Houſe cannot ſtand without *Bellarmine's propter quod*, their Pageantry is all dead Images, unleſs one behind the Curtain move them, which no body muſt ſee; here is no Mercy, Pardon, and Reconciliation for and by their Righteouſneſs, but Chriſt procured ſomething of it, I know not what, but Chriſt's Procurement was long ago, the Law is in their own hands now, he only procured the New Law, they muſt ſhift as well as they can to perform the Conditions; Chriſt did not purchaſe thoſe, neither died he to forgive any fault in their righteouſneſs; but oh, their righteouſneſs comes not up to the old Law, what need they trouble themſelves about that? Chriſt hath fetcht them from under that faulty Perfection, and brought them under a faultleſs unrighteouſneſs of the Remedial Law, and faults their Righteouſneſs muſt have, or elſe it would be an adequate condition, *but they muſt acknowledge their unworthineſs, and deſert of all evil, and when we have done, God looks upon us as righteous in a Goſpel ſenſe.* I had thought in the beginning of this Paragraph Chriſt had bin to have pardoned and mended the faults of our remedial righteouſneſs; but it ſeems here is ſome pretence to it only that Chriſt may not think he is put off with nothing; but the compleating of theſe rough Garments to deceive, lies in their own doings; if we do this, God looks upon us as righteous in a Goſpel-ſenſe, and pardons us, firſt juſtified and not pardoned, and then pardoned and not juſtified: VVhat a great matter of Lamentation is it to ſee the corrupt minds of men thus vainly and miſchievouſly ſport themſelves with the rich Grace of God, and his ſtrict Juſtice.

§. 9. Before I leave this Chapter, let us talk a little further with Mr. *Humph.* about his great challenge, if it be as he ſaith, that no Man or Woman before Chriſt coming, did Imagine they were righteous before God, or accepted for the Obedience of Chriſt, it muſt follow that they had a hard task under the New Law, for they wanted the *propter quod*, and both Mr. *Cl.* and he

ſaith

ſaith their righteouſneſs wants pardon, and they muſt go to the *id propter quod* for pardon and acceptance: Now I would Query, whether if they could not imagine Chriſts Obedience, to be their righteouſneſs, how could they imagine that Chriſts Obedience could be the procuring cauſe, ſo that they were altogether deſtitute of the *id propter quod*. I would know whether the Faith of Gods Children before Chriſt, had no Eye unto Chriſt and his righteouſneſs, in the Sacrifices and ſin Offerings which they offered daily; did they not look at them as ſhadows and types of a better and more perfect Sacrifice, the *Apoſtle* ſaith that the righteouſneſs of God (which we ſhall by and by ſhew to be the righteouſneſs of Chriſt) was witneſſed by the Law (*i. e.* the Law of *Moſes*) and the *Prophets*, and if ſo, its ſtrange that they ſhould have no imagination of it, when as the *Apoſtle Peter*, 1 *Ep.* c. 1. 10 Saith, the *Prophets have Enquired after and ſearched diligently* for this Salvation propheſied of, *Searching what and what manner of times the Spirit of Chriſt which was in them did ſignifie, when it teſtified before hand the ſufferings of Chriſt and the glory which ſhould follow*: The *Apoſtle Peter* was clear in this Point, *Acts* 2. 31 He ſaith that *David* foreſaw the Reſurrection of Chriſt, and ſpake of it, and Chriſt himſelf affirms this after his Reſurrection to the two Diſciples going to *Immaus*, that he *ought thus to ſuffer and enter into Glory, beginning at* Moſes *and all the* Prophets, *he expounded unto them in all the Scripture, the things concerning himſelf*? Now if *Moſes* and all the *Prophets*, yea all the Scriptures ſhould ſo eminently and expreſly foretel Chriſts ſufferings and reſurrection, and why it was? *viz.* to bear Sin and ſatisfie Gods juſtice, as the *Prophet Iſa.* c. 53. and *David*, and *Jer.* and all the Sacrifices of old, and his Redemption was alſo for them, to the tranſgreſſions under the firſt Teſtament, *Heb.* 9. 15. It is ſtrange that none of them from *Adam* to Chriſt, ſhould in the leaſt imagine their acceptance with God ſhould be for his righteouſneſs, but that they ſhould look for Juſtification by their own righteouſneſs only, and none others.

§. 10. Mr. *Cl.* in the concluſion of his Book, undertakes to diſprove the Imputation of the Active righteouſneſs of Chriſt, when as all a long his Book he holds that Chriſt's righteouſneſs Active or Paſſive, is not imputed but as to Effects; now he can mean nothing by the non-imputation of Either, but as to Effects: So that he muſt intend by the non-imputation of Chriſts active Obedience, of the Effect, and then either it had no effects or no effects, *pro bono noſtro*; now ſure if I miſtake not, he grants that whatever Chriſt was, it was for our good, and therefore have ſome benefit by it, and God reckons it a benefit, for that's their Im-

Imputation when we have a benefit, God reckons it ſo, *i. e.* Imputes it to be what it is; ſurely if Chriſt active Obedience, did but fit him to redeem us by paſſive, it was a benefit to us: His Incarnation was it not a benefit? In their way of Imputation they may ſay, [after Mr. *B.*] *becauſe he did not obey, that we ſhould not obey.*

Reſp. Neither did he ſuffer, that we ſhould not ſuffer; but Chriſt ſuffered that we might not ſuffer penally, and obey that we might not obey legally; and its ſtrange that the ſecond *Adam* ſhould have actual righteouſneſs for us, as well as the firſt had actual ſin; that all ſhould not be repaired as to the preceptive, as well as the vindicative part of the Law, which was fallen upon us in the firſt *Adam*, by the ſecond *Adam*. Why was he made under the Law? Was it not for active as well as paſſive Obedience.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Of Justification by Works.

Section 1. *The* Neonomian *Doctrine opposed.* §. 2. *Who it is God justifies.* §. 3. *More fully Answer'd.* §. 4. *Arguments against Justification by Works.* §. 5. *Mr.* Cl's *Proposition.* §. 6. *Of the Jews Opinion about Justification.* §. 7. *Whether* Paul *means only Works of* Moses's *Law.* §. 8. *Whether* Paul *disputes only against some Works.* §. 9. Mr. Cl's *Denial and Challenge.* §. 10. *What Law the Apostle means.* §. 11. *How the Jews looked upon the Law.* §. 12. *Of the Law of Faith.* §. 13. *What Deeds of the Law.* §. 14. *What Works to be boasted of.* §. 15. *Of meritorious Works.* §. 16. *Of justifying Works.* §. 17. *Of the Jews Conceit of Perfect Obedience.* §. 18. 1 Cor. 4. 4. *considered.* §. 19. Mr. Cl. *unfair in his Challenge.* §. 20. *Of* Rom. 4. 5. §. 21. *Of* Rom. 2. 20.

Sect. 1. OUR *Neonomians* affirm we are justified by works, not of the Old Law (which the *Apostle Paul* every were excludes) but of the New Law, this is that which we oppose, and say the *Apostle* doth exclude all our works, even in the state of Regeneracy, from Justification, and in this Point we shall take Mr. *Cl.* because he seems to be most full in the handling of it, and take up that Mr. *H.* saith, in a more scattered manner here and there.

§. 2. Chap. 10. He tells us who it is that God Justifies, *not ungodly, ἢ ἀσεβῆ according to* Rom. 4. 5. *No saith Mr.* Cl. *the Spirit of God means the godly, and he brings against the position of the Spirit of God in this place, that of* Exod. 23. 7. *Where the LXX useth the same words.*

Resp. To which I shall answer, 1. That Mr. *Cl.* knows the LXX doth not translate the words according to the *Heb.* Text; but rather

ther ſpeaks to the drift of the Text, which is to enjoyn unto Men an impartial Execution of diſtributive Juſtice, and therefore it renders it, *Thou ſhalt not juſtifie the wicked for a reward*; and that is the plain Drift of the Text by what precedes, *v.* 6. *Thou ſhalt not wreſt judgment*, and *thou ſhalt take no gift*, *v.* 8. and the *Hebrew* in the 7*th* verſe is, *I will not juſtifie*, *i. e.* will not have thee to juſtifie, for thou art but my Deputy, and I ſit in the Aſſemblies and Courts of Earthly Judges, and whatever Judgment contrary to Juſtice and Right thou paſſeſt, I will call thee to an account for it. Then 1. This Text ſpeaks of Man's Judgment, not of God's immediately, but as ſuperviſing the actions of men. 2. He might as well, or better alledged *Exod.*34.7. where God proclaiming himſelf a ſin-pardoning God, ſaith, he will *by no means clear the guilty*; but in pardon of ſin God doth clear the guilty, and ſo the ungodly, in Juſtification of them by the imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt which takes off the ungodlineſs in that kind, tho man cannot provide for the Juſtification of an unrighteous perſon by gifts or partiality in a way of Juſtice, yet God can by gracious and juſt ways and means provide for the acquitting the guilty, and juſtifying the ungodly juſtly. 2. It muſt be underſtood, *Rom.* 4. according to the words in a ſtrict ſence, *God juſtifies the ungodly*, while ſuch, not to remain ſuch. For *Abraham* there ſpoken of, was ſuch an ungodly vile Idolater, *Joſh.* 24. Had *Abraham* performed any New-Law righteouſneſs before he came out of *Ur*? Mr. *C.* will underſtand it, he ſaith, in a ſtrict Law ſence, *i. e.* that he was a tranſgreſſor of the law of works, ſo will I, and that's therefore to be ungodly, and I know no ungodlineſs but ſuch, and while he was ſuch God juſtified him, and he did no New Law works before he was juſtified, for *Heb.*11. 8. for by faith when he was called of God to go forth he went; ſo that he had faith, and was juſtified before he obey'd the Call. 3. Its moſt conſiſtent with the Grace of God to juſtifie the ungodly, and not in the leaſt derogatory from his Juſtice to juſtifie a ſinner in Gods way of Juſtification 4. As God juſtifies none to be ungodly, nor juſtifies ungodlineſs, but that ſinners may be godly; ſo there's none can be godly before he is juſtified, he cannot perform one godly Act, nor have the Spirit, the natural Man being a ſtranger to God and Enemy to him. 5. Why may not God juſtifie the ungodly, as well as ſanctifie the ungodly, if God may give one gift to the rebellious, why not another? if he may give Grace, why not all Grace? they will have Men juſtified by works; who works in them to will or do? Who gives them this righteouſneſs? Doth not this gift of God find them ungodly? They will ſay, yea undoubtedly, then I will ſay, why may not God give

Chriſt,

Christ, to an ungodly one the gift of righteousness, and justifie him thereby, I hope if God can give one righteousness, he can give another, unless they will limit his Sovereign Grace.

§. 3. 1. But more fully: And first Negatively, not by the Law, *Gal.*2.16. *viz.* the Law of *Moses*; and why so? is there any the least word of the Law of *Moses*, its ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, by the works of a law, any law; when the Apostle speaks of *Moses*'s law, he annexeth the pre-positive Article, *So Rom.* 3. 20. its a law, *from the works of a law no flesh living can be justified*; now this is not the Ceremonial Law, by *v.* 19. but that law whereby *all the world became guilty, Jews and Gentiles, v.* 9, &c. for the *Gentiles* were not guilty by *Moses* Law, neither could the works of the New Law admit of an exception here; for its any law that gives the knowledge of sin. Now if the New Law gives the knowledge of sin, the works of it are here excluded, for that is no law that gives no knowledge of sin. Hence all works of all Laws are here excluded, *i. e.* such as the righteousness thereof required is our obedience performed by us; whence its plain, that the Law of VVorks, the Ceremonial Law, and the New Law are equally excluded. Now the next Verse hath it, that the righteousness of God is manifested without these excluded works, this is no new Notion, but witnessed ἀπὸ τ῀ νόμου, *by the law, i. e.* of *Moses and the Prophets.* VVhat *Gal.* 3. 16. is brought in for I know not, I find it not among the *Errata's*, but I think it must be one, *Hitherto also do belong these places, Job* 15. 14. *chap.*25.4. *Psalm* 143. 2. which Places plainly and peremptorily deny righteousness in Man to be found unto Justification; Mr. *Cl.* says, according to strict Justice, according to the law of works, as *Paul* expounds it, *Gal.*2.16.

Resp. The Apostle there doth peremptorily protest against Justification by the works of a Law, any Law whatever; and if he hath an eye upon the *Psalmists* words, he explains them so far as to us, why the *Psalmist* denies Justification to any man living, is, because all works that Man can perform, must be referred to some law, *by the works of a law no flesh living could be justified.* Let me add what the Apostle saith, *If righteousness be by a law, then Christ died in vain:* Its strange the Apostle should so expressly and positively exclude the works of a Law from Justification, and yet all this while intend that we are justified by the works of a Law, and that he should never tell us, he doth not mean works of the New Law, nor so much as mention it.

§. 4. From the forementioned places, these Arguments will arise against Justification by our works. 1. Justification of a sinner or ungodly one as such, cannot be by any works of a Law,

performed by him, but Gods Juſtification of any fallen Man is ſuch, for the *Major* its plain, againſt *Neonomian* Juſtification, unleſs they will ſay, that a natural Man may be godly while ſuch, or that which the old law calls ungodlineſs, the new law calls godlineſs; yea, a man muſt be ſanctified in their ſenſe, before juſtified, while under condemnation, and bound over to wrath. Again, the Text is clear, that *Abraham* was ungodly when juſtified, both by Hiſtory and the Apoſtles, for he could not do any good, and all his obedience was after his Juſtification by Faith. Now the *Minor* is as Evident, that Gods Juſtification of fallen Man is ſuch, for if we be juſtified by the works of a Law, its not conſiſtent with Grace; for juſtification ſingly conſidered, ſpeaks nothing but Juſtice: And Juſtification by the works of a Law performed by us, ſpeaks nothing but Juſtice; but Juſtification by Grace, is only as the Apoſtle ſaith, when its without the deeds of the Law performed by us.

2. That Doctrine that excludes the works of every Law, by which is the knowledge of Sin, excludes the works of every Law performed by us; but the Apoſtles Doctrine excludes the works of every Law that gives the knowledge of Sin. *Ergo* the works of every Law, Old, New, and Moral Law, are excluded. This Argument ſtands firm from *Rom.* 3. 20.

3. If the holieſt Men have not expected to be juſtified by their own righteouſneſs, who have lived by Faith, then juſtification is not by works of a Law: But the Antecedent is true, therefore the conſequence. The conſequence appears, in that *David* had lived long by Faith, and in Holineſs, when he penned, *Pſal.* 143. 2. And if he thought to be juſtified by New Law works, he need not have ſaid, Enter not into Judgment with thy Servant, unleſs he had added, by the Old Law, but, Enter into Judgment with thy Servant by the New Law, for in thy ſight, New-Law works will juſtifie any Fleſh, *Minor*, *David*, *Job*, *Paul* expected not to be juſtified by New Law Works.

4. Thoſe works that will not make a ſinner clean and pure in the ſight of God, cannot juſtifie him; but no New Law righteouſneſs, will take away Moral Pollution in the ſight of God, ſo as to make him clean. *Ergo*, the *Major* is ſo clear as none can deny, for by Juſtification, the juſtified is purged and clean from Sin in the ſight of God; he can Enter into Judgment with God, upon the account of the righteouſneſs he is juſtified by. The *Minor* is true, 1. From the confeſſion of our Adverſary, that its a ſinful righteouſneſs, its condemned by the Moral Law, its not adequate to exact Juſtice, therefore it will not cover Sin from the Eye of Gods Juſtice. 2. From ſo many expreſs Places of Scripture,

ture, *Job.* 15. 4. He that is righteous before God, muſt be clean before God. Imperfect righteouſneſs, can never make us clean in the ſight of God, *Job.* 15. 4. Its not to be *found of man born of a Woman, i. e.* meer man, nor *in any fleſh living*, Believers are fleſh living, and born of women; *Job* ſaith *chap.* 9. 30. *If I waſh my ſelf in ſnow water, and make my ſelf never ſo clean, yet ſhalt thou plunge me in the ditch, and mine own cloaths ſhall abhor me*; now will *Job*'s new-law-works juſtifie him; he had been long a holy man, yet he often pleaded his uprightneſs towards God, and his integrity againſt his friends charge, and yet you ſee what his new-law-righteouſneſs amounted to, *chap.* 40. 4. & 42 6.

5. Let me add a Fifth Argument before I leave his Negative: If there was never any Law given to fallen Man that could give Life upon the Terms thereof, then there could be no righteouſneſs to Juſtification by a Law; but the *antecedent* is true, therefore the *conſequent*, and both from *Gal.* 3. 1. the Apoſtle's unanſwerable Argument againſt Juſtification by any Law. The words are very plain and full to any one that can conſtrue *Greek.*

§. 5. He proceeds to his further Proof, in divers Propoſitions, which are many, ſo little to the purpoſe, that it would be loſt time to follow them particularly, but that there's in them many places of Scripture perverted from their true Interpretation.

His firſt Propoſal is, *The whole ſcope of the Apoſtle is to aſſert and eſtabliſh Juſtification by faith, as the only way of Salvation to lapſed men.*

Reſp. What if ſo? Doth it therefore follow that the Apoſtle teacheth, that Faith is the way of Juſtification by Works? or quite contrary, that Juſtification by Faith is not by *the works of righteouſneſs which we have done, but by thoſe that Chriſt hath done? This I gather*, ſaith he, *from that place* Rom. 1. 17. *The righteouſneſs of God is revealed from faith to faith, which words I paraphraſe thus, That the Goſpel alone diſcovers the method and way appointed by God, whereby we may become righteous in his account*, viz. *by faith in Chriſt, and by continuance, increaſe and exerciſe thereof.*

Reſp. Its the Office of the Goſpel, to teach Sinners *the way, the truth and life*, who is Chriſt; there's no other righteouſneſs that the Goſpel can teach a ſinner to Juſtification, *John* 14. 6. and that Faith lays hold on that way, is the Goſpel; to teach a man that he is to be juſtified by the works of a law, is it Good News to a ſinner? That this Text is groſly abuſed, appears,

1. Becauſe the righteouſneſs of God here ſpoken of, is a righteouſneſs revealed, and therefore not in us; for things already in us, are not ſaid to be revealed to us.

2. Its *the righteouſneſs of God*, and not of Man.

3. Its an objective righteouſneſs that is here ſpoken of, ſuch as is made known to our Faith by Revelation, therefore not Faith it ſelf.

4. It appears by the Proof, in that the life of a *juſt one is by faith* feeding upon another's righteouſneſs, not his own. In a word, according to Mr. *Cl*'s ſence, it ſhould be this, The Goſpel is the Method of God unto Salvation, for therein is the righteouſneſs of man revealed from faith to faith, *viz.* the more a man believes in Chriſt, the more he believes he is juſtified by his own works, and this is that he lives by, he lives by faith, *i. e.* by believing his faith to be works.

He diſproves Juſtification by works of a law as inconſiſtent therewith, becauſe all are ſinners, and therefore none can be juſtified by their works, and on the other hand, that they muſt be juſtified by faith.

Reſp. One would think this man ſpake now good Divinity, but his meaning is, only that Juſtification of a ſinner by the works of the old law, is inconſiſtent, but not Juſtification by the works of a new law; whereas the deſign of the Apoſtle throughout is to diſprove the Juſtification of a ſinner by the works of a law, any law; he ſpecifies not any one law in particular, unleſs where he led to it, but when he oppoſeth Works to Faith in Juſtification, he ſpeaks of law indefinitely excluding all works of any law whatever, ſignified to us, *Gal.* 3. 2. *If there had been any law given, whereby life is given, then righteouſneſs had been by a law*, but there was no ſuch law given.

§. 6. *The Apoſtle inſiſts largely on this Diſpute againſt Juſtification by works, becauſe it was a received Opinion among the Jews, that a man might be juſtified by the works of the law, and it was retained by many of them, even after they were converted to the faith of Chriſt, as appears Acts* 21. 20.

Reſp. The Apoſtle inſiſted largely and ſtrenuouſly on this Diſpute, in making and proving the direct oppoſition between Juſtification by the works of any law performed by us, and Juſtification by faith in the righteouſneſs of another, 1. Becauſe the *Jews* were generally bigotted to a righteouſneſs of ſome law to be performed by them for Juſtification. 2. Becauſe they were generally ignorant of the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which made them go about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs in Point of Juſtification. 3. What he writes to the converted *Jews*, he doth, 1. In order to convince them of the danger of joining their own righteouſneſs in obedience to any law in Juſtification, with the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and this was the danger of the *Galatians*. 2. He warns them of the vanity of the continuance of the works of *Moſes's*

ſes's law in order to Salvation. Now Mr. *Cl.* brings the words of *James* to *Paul*, *Acts* 21. 20. to prove that the converted *Jews* ſought *Juſtification by the works of the Law of works*: To which I anſwer.

1. That the unconverted *Jews* did none of them expect Juſtification by the works of the law of works, for 1. They did not look upon their works as perfect works (though they took the external obedience to be what the law mainly looked for which Chriſt refutes) for they owned that their external works were mixed with much imperfection and ſin. Elſe 2*dly*, They could not own the Doctrine of Sacrifices for ſin, wherein they ſaw the ſinfulneſs of their works, and were convinced at leaſt thereof, whether they ſaw by faith the Antitype ſignified by them or no, and therefore could ſtand upon their works in themſelves perfect, in anſwer to the righteouſneſs of that law, but the Juſtification by works which they looked for, was by an imperfect righteouſneſs (as the *Neonomians* do) in obedience to the law of *Moſes*, which they made their new law, as the *Neonomians* do the Goſpel, and therefore the Apoſtle ſaith, *that they ſought it as it were by the works of the law*, it was Juſtification by works in their ſence, the Apoſtle preacheth accordingly againſt works, as taken by themſelves, *Rom.* 9.

Anſ. 2. As for the converted *Jews*, ſpoken of, *Acts* 21. they where for the obſervations of ſome things in the Obedience of *Moſes* his Law, as neceſſary means of Salvation, not aboliſh'd by Chriſts coming in the Fleſh; and as the Apoſtles did not preſs harder upon them in that Point, than only to leave them under an indifferency of uſing them or not, provided they laid not the ſtreſs of their Juſtification thereon, as appears by *Acts* 15. So here the charge againſt *Paul*, which the Apoſtle *James* would have him clear himſelf of, was, that he contradicted the Apoſtles at *Jeruſalem* in permitting the uſe of ſome *Jewiſh* Ceremonies as indifferent for the preſent, by reaſon of the *Jews* weakneſs, thou teacheſt the *Gentiles* to forſake *Moſes*: Now he ſhewed by his complying with *James*, that whatever he taught the *Gentiles*, yet he was not againſt complying with the *Jews*, ſo far as to uſe yet ſome of *Moſes* his appointment, provided they made not ſuch Actions of theirs the righteouſneſs of Juſtification, therefore tells the *Galatians* running on that Point, that if they were circumciſed, Chriſt could profit them nothing. Now this is clearly the Point he withſtands *Peter* in, and oppoſeth the *Galatians*, in that he made his Saviour a Tranſgreſſor by his practice in judaizing contrary to the Doctrine he had preached in Juſtification, by Chriſts righteouſneſs alone: As for the others, they brought in

another Goſpel, not one, whatever they called it. Hence the complaint againſt ſome believing *Phariſees*, *Acts* 15. 5. was that they taught the neceſſity of keeping *Moſes*'s Law unto full juſtification, the conjoining our righteouſneſs with his, or that his righteouſneſs meritted ours; and therefore they were to obſerve *Moſes* his Law as their own righteouſneſs (the New Law with them) this Doctrine *Peter* oppoſeth in his ſpeech unto *ver.* 11. to which *James* agrees, and propoſeth an expedient, *ver.* 19, 20. ſo that what the *Phariſees* attempted at *Antioch*, and what the *Galatians* were ſeduced to, was only the neceſſity of the works of a New Law, as a ſole or ſocial righteouſneſs with Chriſts for Juſtification, *Pro.* 9. 3.

§. 7. *When he diſputes againſt Juſtification by Works, he means only the Works of the Law.*

Reſp. He ſhould have told us what Law the Apoſtles means, Moral, or Ceremonial, or New Law; or whether works of any Law whatever, which we confidently affirm, and if he make Goſpel works, Law works, he diſputes againſt them. And this propoſition of his, he is large in proving with little Proof. 1 It appears, he ſaith, by the Apoſtles, wary, cloſe and reſtrictive way of ſpeaking, *Rom.* 3. 20. The reſtrictiveneſs of that place, we have ſpoken to; and ſhewed the place is poſitively againſt all works of any Law, Again, we have ſhewed that *Gal.* 2. 20. Is an abſolute excluſion of the works of a Law, any Law, for as Mr. *C.* obſerves the works of a Law, are three times excluded; we ſhall not *actum agere* as near as may be. *Gal.* 3. The deſign of the Apoſtle in that Chapter, is to ſhew, 1. That a believer of the *Gentiles* is bleſſed, *i. e.* Juſtified by Faith with faithful *Abraham*, *ver.* 9. to prove this, he argues thus; either by Faith, or by Works, not by works of a Law, any Law, for (ſaith he) he that is a ſinner, and under a Law for Juſtification, is under a Curſe, nor cannot come from under it by the works of it: And that you may take an inſtance of the Voice of any Law, take that of *Moſes*, ver. 10. *curſed is every one that abideth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them*, i. e. τῷ νόμῳ, *Moſes* his Law. Becauſe by a Law, any Law, *no fleſh living is juſtified with God*, or *before God*, manifeſt, becauſe *the juſt ſhall live by faith*, and ſhall draw the firſt breath of the life of Juſtification *by faith*, and live that life always by it, which is not to get life by our own works, but living by and upon the righteouſneſs of another by faith, and thus he argues from *Moſes*'s Law to every Law, that works of neither cannot juſtifie; and when he ſpeaks of *Moſes* his law, he ſeldom underſtands the meer Ceremonial Law, but the Moral alſo, as recognized under *Moſes*, and that of *Gal.* 5. 4. κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ,

ye

ye are abdicated from Christ whoever of you are justified by the works of a law; in Mr. *Cl*'s. sence it is whoever of you are justified by the works of some law only; so *Paul* opposeth Christ himself to the works that are of a Law, *Phil.* 3. 9. *His own righteousness*, he saith, *is such, viz.* this he desires *to be found out of*, but in Christ, *viz. his righteousness by Faith*, which he opposeth to *his own*, as that which he calls *the righteousness of God*, in opposition to the *righteousness of Man*. He saith indeed in one place, *Works are mentioned in general*, *Rom.* 4. 2. Its true, but he takes not Notice how often Law is mentioned in general, and so the works of a Law are general where-ever spoken so of. But he saith, *these words must be understood with a limitation too, and be meant of the same kind of works.*

Resp. And therefore the words import thus, if *Abraham* were justified by some kind of works he hath wherein to Glory, but why should some kind of works give *Abraham* more cause of boasting than others? He will say, because some are great and perfect, others little and imperfect, but I say there's no specifick difference between great and little of the same kind; besides he that attains a great End by a small work, hath more cause of boasting than he that attains it by great work and Labour; therefore a Man may rather boast of the works of the New Law, than of the Old, and then they are all works opposed by him to Faith, for he saith, *the reward is to him that worketh*, not that that Expression excludes all works, for *Paul* could not be so absurd to express works by not working.

§. 8. *If* Paul *understood himself*, &c. *We must grant and conclude that* Paul *disputes only against the works of the Law.*

Resp. No doubt he knew his own Mind, and was consistent with himself, and if such plain Expressions are intelligible, he excludes all works of any Law what ever, but he gives his reason why he means we are justified by works, when he saith positively, *we are not justified by works*, and that, *he that worketh not, but is ungodly. Because they were such works as did frustrate and evacuate the undertakings of Christ*, Rom. 4. 14. Gal. 5. 4.

Resp. So do all works of a Law brought in for righteousness, for if the great End of Christ's undertaking, was to be our Justifying-righteousness, then any works brought into the room thereof frustrate Christ's righteousness, but that was the chief End of Christ's undertaking, *Rom.* 4. 25. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. The words of *Rom.* 4. 14. are, *if they that be of a Law be Heirs*, i. e. such as claim by the works of a Law performed by them, *Faith is made Void*, i. e. its to no purpose to believe on another for righteousness, Faith is made empty of the righteousness of another, κεκόνω-

Jet, and the Promiſe or Goſpel is abdicated, for the ſame thing cannot be Law and Promiſe, or Goſpel, and the reaſon is given, becauſe you ſee the law of *Moſes* worketh wrath, *and where there's no law there's no tranſgreſſion*, the law determines the tranſgreſſion, and the ſinner to wrath for it, and this doth every law whatever. The other Scriptures were ſpoken to before.

2d Reaſon, *They are ſuch works as he oppoſeth every way to faith, and alſo to Grace*, Gal. 4. 4. *therefore they are not faith, or any inherent grace*, Gal. 5. 4. *But he never oppoſeth faith and Goſpel-Works.*

Reſp. He always oppoſeth Faith and all Works, in the Point of Juſtification, becauſe Works juſtifie by themſelves, but Faith by its Object only.

Becauſe Goſpel-works ſuppoſe Faith, or Grace, being the fruit of Faith, and product of Grace.

Reſp. A pitiful Reaſon, becauſe a man that runs apace is ſuppoſed to ſee, therefore a man runs by his eyes, and after this manner he applies, 1 *Cor.* 15. 10. *by the Grace of God I am what I am* —— and *laboured more abundantly than they all*; *ergo*, *Paul* was juſtified by works, is not this a very learned conſequence?

I grant, ſaith he, *faith and works of the law are frequently oppoſed by the Apoſtle.*

Reſp. Then faith and works of a law are not the ſame, in this he gives us the Cauſe. Let us ſee his Conceſſions further:

I grant, ſaith he, *a meer profeſſion of faith is oppoſed to works*, James 2. 14.

Reſp. True Faith, fruitful in good works, is oppoſed to falſe faith that has no fruits.

3. *I grant that even Goſpel-works are oppoſed to Grace*, (*tho not to faith*) *both in Election*, Rom. 11. 5, 6. *and in Vocation*, 2 Tim. 1. 9.

Reſp. Works of a law, by which a man claims Juſtification, are not Goſpel-works, but Legal, and they are oppoſed to Grace, both in Election, Vocation and Juſtification; but as Election is not on the foreſight of any works or righteouſneſs, no not of Chriſt's, and Vocation is not upon our performance of any works, no more is Juſtification.

I grant, God chooſeth not upon foreſight of good works, or faith in us, neither call any becauſe they have faith or good works, but that they may have them, his Grace is antecedent to any good in us; but now the caſe is otherwiſe in reference to thoſe priviledges which follow Vocation, for God juſtifies and glorifies us, yet not as the meritorious cauſe thereof, but only as a way, means and qualification, &c.

Reſp. Well now the Caſe is altered, Grace goes no further than Vo-

Vocation, there it makes a ſtand, and man does the reſt himſelf; but let us enquire a little into this Myſtery: Is a man effectually called and made holy, and yet not juſtified? for he that is made holy in order to Juſtification, ſuppoſe qualified and conditionated for it, is in order of Nature, holy before juſtified, *i. e.* hath the Spirit of Holineſs, the Gift of Grace, and inherent righteouſneſs, whilſt a child of wrath, and actually under the curſe of the law. 2. All Juſtification for Holineſs, becauſe it is the work of a law, is meritorious righteouſneſs; for there's no law juſtifies but becauſe the performance of the condition deſerves it in Juſtice. Hence all Qualifications and Means made legally, conditionally to the remunerative part of the Law are deſerving thereof, and meritorious, and undeniably ſo; for if the abſence of the Qualification and the Means, or Non-performance of the Condition, doth merit or deſerve the Wages of the Sin from the Law, enjoyning the ſaid Qualifications or Conditions, then having, and performance thereof, doth upon the ſame Reaſon merit and deſerve the Reward of Righteouſneſs; but the Antecedent is true, therefore the Conſequent.

§. 9. He proceeds with Confidence. 2dly. *I do abſolutely deny, that a true, Goſpel juſtifying Faith, and Goſpel-Works, are ever oppoſed to one another, and do confidently affirm the contrary, becauſe I have examined all Places where Faith and Works are mentioned, and do not find them, if any affirm, let him prove it.*

R. Mr. *Cl*'s Confidence is no Proof, and his ſearching the Scriptures, and not finding ſo plain a Truth, as that Juſtification by Faith, is oppoſed to Juſtification by Works; argues, but judicial blindneſs, whereby God hath hardned his Heart, and blinded his Eyes.

1. As was ſaid before all Goſpel-works (as he calls his New Law Works) brought into Juſtification by a Law are legal not Goſpel, not accepted of God but leaves a Man under a Curſe.

2. Thoſe that are Goſpel-works are Fruits of the Spirit, thro' the Gift of Grace, and Fruits of Faith, as they are Fruits of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, believed in to Juſtification; and no cauſe of Juſtification in the leaſt, neither doth the Believer claim Juſtification thereby, and hence called Goſpel-Wurks; but if he claim Juſtification by them, they are Works and oppoſed to Faith, but looſe the Name of Goſpel, are Legal, droſs and dung, and ſtink in the Noſtrils of God, neither are any ſuch Works the gracious Gifts of the Spirit, or true Faith or the good Fruit of it. For ſuch ſeek Righteouſneſs as it were, *by the Works of the Law*, and obtain it not.

3. Now whereas Mr. *Cl.* here throws down his Gantlet in an Ambi-

Ambiguous manner, we take it up in the true State of the Difference, and confidently affirm, that Juſtification by Faith is poſitively oppoſed by the Apoſtle *Paul* to Juſtification by any Works of a Law whatever performed by us, the proving of which is the drift of this whole Diſpute as now managed.

4. He ſaith, *there was no Coutroverſie about any other Works, but the Works of the Law.*

Reſp. There was no Controverſie about any Works, but the Works of a Law, no more is there now, *Gal.* 5. 4. The Apoſtle ſaith, *They are abdicated from Chriſt, and fallen from Grace, that are juſtified by a Law*; ſo ſay we.

§. 10. Propoſition 4. *This Law was the whole Body of the Moſaical Law, conſiſting of precepts Moral, Ceremonial, and Judicial*; what he ſaith, under this propoſition, about the acceptation of the term Law, I think will not hold all of it with his other Doctrine, for he ſaith its taken. 1. *For any written Declaration or Revelation of the Will of God concerning our Duty.* 2. *Its frequently taken for the Moral Law, as* Rom. 7. 12. *and* Ch. 3. 31. Mat. 5. 17. Luke 16. 17. 3. *Its uſed Indefinitely, for the whole Body of the Law given to* Moſes, *and therefore he mentions it in ſuch general Terms.*

R. Becauſe Law is uſed in ſo many Senſes in Scripture, and thoſe that would introduce Juſtification by Works are apt to ſlip from one Law to another, and ſay, as Mr. *Cl.* doth, that though the Apoſtle deny Juſtification by one Law, yet he intends Juſtification by Works of another Law; therefore the Apoſtle excludes our Works of any Law whatever, as frequently in his Epiſtles as hath been ſhewed, ſo in that expreſs and plain Place, *Gal.* 3. 21. *If there had been a Law given which could have given Life, verily Righteouſneſs ſhould have been by the Law?* And why is it ſpoken? It's ſpoken as a Reaſon, that the Law of *Moſes*, ὁ νόμος, was not againſt the Promiſe; *i. e.* againſt Juſtification by the Promiſe and Gift of Righteouſneſs, no, the Law of *Moſes* taken together was ſo far from being againſt this way of Juſtification without the Works of a Law, that it witneſſed to it, as the Apoſtle expreſly ſpeaks, *Rom.* 3. 21. It did not appropriate the Grace of the Promiſe to it ſelf, but by the whole Tenor of it witneſſed to the Promiſe and Righteouſneſs. The Law of *Moſes* taken as a Law, did juſtifie none, *Gal.* 3. 11. For ſaith the Apoſtle, the Law (*i. e.* as ſuch) is not of Faith, *ver.* 12. The Condition of it being Works, and therefore Juſtification by the Law is not Juſtification by Faith, the Apoſtle ſaying further, *ver.* 18. *If the Inheritance be of a Law, than no more of Promiſe.* ver. 19. For what end ſerved the Law given by *Moſes*? *Anſw.* It was added, becauſe of Tranſgreſſion, till the Seed ſhould come to whom the Promiſe was

was made, *i. e.* Chriſt, but why? added for two Ends. 1. That Sin might be diſtinctly known by the Moral Part, as the Apoſtle by the Knowledge of Sin. 2. That by the Ceremonial Law there might be a Typical Redemption and Satisfaction held forth unto them, through which they might have a ſight of Faith, and of the true Sacrifice held forth unto them.

§. 11. Propoſition 5. *The Law was looked upon by the Carnal* Jews *as a Covenant of Works*, Mat. 19. 16. Granting that it was; yet not to be fulfill'd by a perfect Obedience, but by imperfect, as appears by his Words, *What good thing ſhall I do that I may inherit Eternal Life?* As much as to ſay, I have done Good and Evil, I would know what that good thing is whereby I may be righteous to Life Eternal. *He depreciates the Law calling it a Miniſtration of Death and Condemnation*, 2 Cor. 3. 7, 9. It was the true Senſe of the Apoſtle, that the Law of *Moſes* or any other Commands of God, underſtood uſed, and applied as a Law for Juſtification by the Works of it, is a Miniſtration of Death, and not of Faith, and as a Ceremonial Law, which *Heb.* 6. 19. is made nothing and by it ſelf perfect, it being Typical, and the Type abſolutely conſidered, could not purifie them as to Conſcience. The Apoſtle ſaith, it was weak through our weakneſs, *Rom.* 8. 3. We being not able to come to the Terms of this, nor of any other; and *Rom.* 6. 14. ſaith we, *i. e.* Believers are not *under a Law, but under Grace* for Juſtification, as much as to ſay, you take the Doctrine of Grace to be a licentious Doctrine but believe it, its the legal Doctrine that leads to Sin, not the Doctrine of Grace; beſides the Apoſtle ſhews plainly, that to look for Juſtification by the Law of *Moſes*, or of any other is to be Married to it, which he ſhews *Rom.* 7. is quite contrary to our Marriage to Chriſt, by Faith, while we are in expectation of Juſtification by a Law, we are held in Bondage, but being by the true Sence of the Nature of it Dead to it, it becomes Dead to us; Now we are delivered from the Law, that being Dead wherein we were held, and there's no other Husband comes in the room of the Dead Law, no new Law, but Chriſt only. And the Oppoſition (ſaith Mr. *Cl.*) is only between the Law of Works and the Law of Faith, if he make the Law of Faith to be a Law of Works then its no Oppoſition at all, becauſe both are a Law of Works; and why I pray is Juſtification by Faith, Juſtification by Works, doth the Apoſtle ſpeak any where of a new Law or the Works of it? No he ſpeaks of the Law of Faith. Let us ſee then what is in that Expreſſion, *Rom.* 3. 27, 28.

§. 12. *The Apoſtle having told us, how we are Juſtified freely by Grace, who are Sinners in all reſpects*, ver. 24, 25, 26. Infers, elegantly

elegantly where is boaſting then? *i. e.* Of our own Righteouſneſs, faith its ſhut quite out a Doors. By what Law? doth any Law ſhut out boaſting? No faith the Apoſtle, doth not Works? Nay, they cauſe boaſting. what Law then? Such a Law, if you will have a Law, as the Nature of Faith, its in the very Nature of Faith to ſhut out Works; therefore we conclude, that we are juſtified by Faith without the Works of a Law; is not Juſtification by Faith and Works here plainly oppoſed? Now that Law is taken for the Nature of a Thing, many Inſtances might be given, but for the preſent take *Rom.* 7. 23. ſo *Rom.* 8. 2. The Law, is the Nature of the Spirit of Life that is in Chriſt. Let us ſee what Senſe it will be in the *Neonomian* Interpretation, where is boaſting then? it is excluded, by what Law? Works, *i. e.* the Old Law of Works, nay; but by the Works of the New Law Work, excludes boaſting of Works, boaſting is excluded not by the Law of Works, but by the Law of Works; therefore we conclude, that a Man is juſtified by Works without Works, not by ſome, but by other Works.

§. 13. Propoſition 6. *The Works or Deeds of this Law are ſuch as are performed by our own Strength in Obedience thereto, ſuch as* Adam *had in the State of Innocency, hence called their own Righteouſneſs*, Rom. 10. 3.

R. I enquire whether giving Strength and Power to perform Works hinders them from being Works of the Law, or would it have hindred *Adams* had he ſtood, and I marvel that any Man will ſay, that *Adam* in innocency had not Strength given him by God, but whether he had or had not. it makes nothing to the Point in Hand, which is the Conſideration of the Reſpect or Relation that Works have to the Law, which enquire not how a Man came by his Money, but whether it be Good and Current, *Rom.* 10. 3. is falſly explained, as we ſhall ſhew anon; neither doth the Spirit of God ſavingly ſtrengthen us to the performance of any Works of our own for Juſtification, and ſuch as any Man claims by, are not Goſpel-Obedience nor performed by the Spirit.

§. 14. Propoſition 7. *They were ſuch Works as did admit of boaſting*, Rom. 3. 27. *Eph.* 2. 9. *Rom.* 4. 2. *For what we do of our ſelves without the help of another we may boaſt of?*

R. Can it be ſuppoſed that any underſtanding *Jews* or *Gentile*, do think they can do good upon a meer natural or moral Conſideration without Help and Strength from God. 2. How ſhall Men know they have ſupernatural Aſſiſtance, its certain they have it not graciouſly, when they aim by their Duties to ſet up themſelves for juſtifying Righteouſneſs. 3. The boaſting ſpoken of in the Places mentioned, is glorying before God ſitting on a Throne

of

of Juſtice diſpenſing it by a Law, now that Perſon that doth come with his own Righteouſneſs in his own Hand, and will ſay here are my Works, Faith, Obedience, Repentance, Sincerity performed by me, juſtifie me for them, or by them, this is the glorying the Apoſtle excludes, and Faith always excludes, and the Apoſtle ſaith, Gods giving the Reward upon theſe Terms is paying of a Debt, and not of Grace, for whatever is demandable upon our own Performances in a way of Juſtice is not of Grace. The Apoſtle to *Eph.* 2. ſpeaks *v.* 7. of God ſhewing forth the Riches of his Grace in Juſtification (as appears by foregoing Context) of vile miſerable Sinners, and ſaith, its in his kindneſs to us thro' Chriſt, and then *v.* 8. gives the Reaſon, *For by Grace are we ſaved* (Juſtification being an eminent part of Salvation) *through Faith* (receiving that Juſtification and Salvation) now leaſt any one ſhould call this Faith, Works, as the *Neonomians* do, he poſitively excludes all Works, and not of Works, not through Faith as a Work, and leaſt any one ſhould ſay, he is beholding only to himſelf for his Faith; he tells us, its a Gift of God, and its a Gift of Sanctification not of Juſtification as appears by the Text, that's only the Object of Faith, the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

§. 15. Propoſition 8. *Theſe Works* [viz. of the Old Law] *are meritorious, implied in that Deſcription*, Rom. 10. 5.

Reſp. The Deſcription the Apoſtle gives there of Legal Works is ſuch as belongs to all Law-works, for there's no Law that enjoins perſonal Obedience for the Condition, let it be more or leſs, but it makes the ſaid Obedience meritorious, and the promiſed Reward a Debt, *Rom.* 4. 4. and this Merit belongs not only to the Law of Works at firſt, but to all Works of any Law for Juſtification, theſe are the Works a Man may boaſt of, tho' he receive them as Gift from another, for if a Man gives the Grace of God in Works, in payment to the Law of God, he pays God you will ſay in his own Coyn, but yet his preſenting them to God for Juſtification, in Satisfaction to a Law, is high abuſe of the Grace of God perverting to an end that God never intended. The Law of Faith, which he tells of was never intended to be a Law of Works, for the Apoſtle uſeth it in Oppoſition to Works, and to prevent the Miſtake theſe Men are run upon, *viz.* that they ſhould underſtand the Work of Faith to be meant by him, where he ſaith, it is of Faith that it may be of Grace, becauſe Faith aſcribes nothing to it ſelf as fulfilling to any Law, it is ſaid by the Law of Faith, either according to the nature of true Faith, as hath been ſaid, or elſe according to the Ordination of God, that we ſhould be juſtified by Faith without Works, Gods Ordination of thing as to the End, and Means, doth not always make

it

it a Law of Sanction, God hath ordained to give Faith, to give the Spirit, to give the Relation of Children. Doth God give them in a Law, *Do this and live?*

§. 16. Propoſition 9. *Theſe Works are perfect and unſinning Works.*

Reſp. This is a great Miſtake, that God hath brought in ſinning VVorks for Juſtification, inſtead of perfect VVorks. 1. God never made a Law where ſinning VVorks, were the Condition of the Law, this would be contrary to his Holineſs and Juſtice. But if God makes a Law wherein he ſaith *do and live*, let the doing be more or leſs, perfect or imperfect, yet a Man doing the thing commanded, his VVork is rewarded as meritorious, and its perfect as to the Law, that it is to be righteous in the Sence of the Law, and to be meritorious. He that performs the Condition of a Law, and he never ſins at all in the Eye of the Law, therefore all juſtifying Righteouſneſs in any Law is unſinning, therefore this Plea will ſerve no more for Ejection of the VVorks of the Old Law, than for the Ejection of the VVorks of the New Law out of Juſtification. Hence we ſee the pretence of caſting out the VVorks of the Old Law is frivolous and vain, becauſe they are performed by our Strength, which none can pretend to, no not *Adam* in Innocency, or becauſe they introduce boaſting when the VVorks of any Law do, when Juſtification is pleaded for thereby, they are meritorious, when the VVorks of any Law are ſo, or they are unſinning and perfect, when the VVorks, of any Law muſt be ſo, or elſe it juſtifies not.

§. 17. Prop. 10. *The* Jews *many of them did Conceit and Fancy that they could yield perfect Obedience to this Law ſo as to need no Pardon. This he would prove from*, Luke 16. 15. *and* Luke 18. 9.

Reſp. It is not to be granted, that a People that offered ſo many Sacrifices for Sin, ſhould think they could yield perfect Obedience to the Law of God. That of *Luke* 16. proves not his Aſſertion, for Chriſt ſpeaks only of the Juſtification before Men by their external Actions, and he ſhews that neither their external nor internal would juſtifie them before God, and beſides, he tells them that which Men account Righteouſneſs, God looks upon as an Abomination. Nor that *Chap.* 18. 9. for he there condemns, plainly looking for Juſtification by Mens own Righteouſneſs, and truſting to it. VVhat doth a *Neonomian* do leſs then they, when he looks upon himſelf as Righteous to Juſtification by his own Righteouſneſs? thence he gives the Inſtance of the proud *Phariſee*, and poor *Publican*, he ſaith, the *Publican* of the two lookt more like a Juſtified Perſon, becauſe he renounced his own Righteouſneſs, and applied himſelf wholly to the Mercy of God, as a poor

Sin-

Sinner not pleading any works at all of any kind. 2. It is to be supposed the carnal *Jews* did look for Justification by their own Righteousness, tho' they looked not at themselves as Righteous in perfect performance of the Moral Law; for if so, they could not have been so Zealous for *Moses* his ceremonial Law, the chiefest part whereof, was the *Levitical* Priesthood and Sacrifices, they could not but know that the very High-Priest sinned, and offered first *for his own Sins, and then for the Sins of the People*; yea, that Sin polluted their holiest things, and therefore Sacrifices for Sin were offered for them, yea, *all sprinkled with Blood*. But they having such apprehensions of their Justification, as the *Neonomians* have of theirs; they fall under the severe remarks of the Lord Christ and his Apostles.

1. They looked upon *Moses* his Law, as that which was their New Law for Justification by imperfect Righteousness, in opposition to the Old Law, as first given to *Adam* in Innocency.

2. They looked upon the Sanction of the Law of Works as to perfection, to be abrogated or relaxed, that God would accept them for their sincerity in Imperfect works; so *Paul* in his unregeneracy.

3. They looked to the *Opus operatum* in all Obedience to *Moses* his Law, for because, 1. They looked for forgiveness by the Offering up of Sin-Offering, meerly without looking to the Antitype by Faith. 2. They looked upon the most material part of the Law of Works to be taken up into *Moses* his Law, their New Law, now its Impossible but the New Law to them (if ever any such thing was Exhibited and dispensed by *Moses* his Law, which indeed (being spiritually understood, was the *Jews* Gospel) therefore saith the Apostle, *they sought Righteousness*, Rom. 9. *As it were, by the Works of a Law*, tho' it was imperfect, yet the works of a Law, and never attained to a law of Righteousness, and why? Because they went to Establish their own imperfect Righteousness, but sought not after a true perfect Righteousness which was not their own, but Christs, *Rom.* 10.3.4. Now saith the Apostle, these are engaged in a great mistake, for they think to have a Justification by an impepfect partial Obedience, but they become hereby Debtors to keep the whole Law of *Moses*, Moral and Ceremonial, but such as seek such Justification by Law-Works, either Legal or Evangelical, (for the New-Law must be such, else they were not saved even as we) *are abdicated from Christ, and fallen from Grace*, Gal. 3. 3, 4. As for the words of the rich Man, *Luke* 11.21. And as to *Paul*'s sentiments in his unregeneracy, *Phil.* 3. 6. They are to be understood only as to common account, and gross Actions, not that *Paul* thought he

was perfect as to Moral-Obedience, but that he was imperfectly righteous, by ſome degrees of moral obedience, together with his *Moſaical* Expiation for Sin, and this is no other than his New-Law righteouſneſs, hence *Rom.* 7. 9. *he was alive without the law once*, *i. e.* he once laid aſide the thoughts of the ſpirituality and exactneſs of the righteouſneſs of the true law of God, and therefore caſt it off, but was wholly taken up with a New-Law righteouſneſs, imperfect, and that God would accept this to Juſtification; but when he came to ſee the true law, and what righteouſneſs he muſt be juſtified by, or periſh eternally, then *ſin revived*, then he could ſee ſin with a vengeance in himſelf, and died to all Juſtification by his works, or by a law, of what kind ſoever it was.

§. 18. *There's one place yet behind under the branch of Negative*, 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. *I know nothing by my ſelf, yet am I not hereby juſtified.*

Reſp. This place is againſt Mr. *Cl.* for here are two things in it: He tells us of a twofold Judgment of God that he looked for. 1. That of his Perſon. 2. The regularity and ſincerity of his Actions and Deportment. Whatever Cenſures Men were ready to paſs upon him, yet he had *the teſtimony of a good conſcience*, as *chap.* 1. but whatever his ſimplicity and godly ſincerity was, he expected not to be juſtified by it; but it might be ſaid, your actions are condemned by men, and *there's none that doeth good and ſinneth not*, and ſo may you in diſcharge of your Apoſtleſhip: He ſaith, as to my actions, God knows what they are, and he will teſtifie to them before the World that condemns them, when he ſhall come and lay open the ſecret and hidden things of darkneſs; therefore he diſowns plainly Juſtification by New-law-works, and he appeals plainly to the Judgment of God, as to his ways and works, to be ſuch wherein he is Evangelically, thro Chriſt, approved of God, as ſuch as are regular, ſincere, and from a true Principle, renouncing Juſtification thereby, but deſiring to walk in all well-pleaſing to God in Sanctification.

§. 19. It is now time to look back a little, and take notice of the great Challenge Mr. *Cl.* makes, *I do abſolutely deny true Goſpel works and juſtifying faith are oppoſed one to another*; which is very unfairly made as to the Terms, whereas, Juſtifying-Faith and Goſpel-Works, as the fruits of juſtifying are conſentaneous, as Cauſe and Effects, and therefore as ſuch, in their due place, they are not oppoſite one to another; but let the Queſtion be ſtated right, and we will receive the Challenge, *Whether the Scripture doth not oppoſe faith and works, as ſuch, of all ſorts in the point of Juſtification?* We affirm that it doth, and a little Logick-Light here is not amiſs, to conſider that diſtinguiſhing Properties of Oppoſites for diſſentaneous

taneous Arguments are *diverſa vel oppoſita*, *diverſa*'s diſſent only in a certain reſpect, may be in the ſame ſubject at the ſame time; a man may be rich and wiſe too, in a different reſpect, at the ſame time. But as for *oppoſites*, they do diſagree both in reſpect, and indeed really in their nature, and muſt have their proper diſtinguiſhing Properties, which are, that they cannot be attributed to the ſame thing, to the ſame place, and in the ſame reſpect, nor at the ſame time; ſo that one of the *oppoſites* being affirmed, the other muſt be denied. Now then, according to the true logical acceptation of *faith* and *works* in Juſtification, they are oppoſed expreſly, and they are *contraria oppoſita unum uni & adverſa contraria affirmantia quæ inter ſe velut è regione perpetuò adverſantur.* Now then,

Arg. 1. *If Faith and Works of a Law are not oppoſed in Juſtification, then a Man may be juſtified by Faith and Works in the ſenſe of the Apoſtle, and in the ſame reſpect:* But the conſequence is not true, the *minor* is proved, that *Paul* doth not intend that any Man is juſtified at the ſame time, and in the ſame reſpect, by Faith and Works too; for then all his diſpute againſt one and for the other, would be very unfair, to ſay a Man is not juſtified by the Works of a Law, and yet that he is juſtified by the Works of a Law, let us take *Rom.* 3. 28. a concluſion drawn from the Excluſion of the deeds of a Law from Juſtification, therefore we conclude that a Man is juſtified by Faith, without the deeds of a Law. Let Mr. *Cl.* conſtrue it better if he can: *yes*, ſaith he, *his meaning is without the deeds of the Law of Innocency, but not without the deeds of the New Law*; i. e. *the Law of Faith:* Its ſtrange the Apoſtle ſhould ſpeak then Excluſively, of all works indefinitely; the Apoſtle might as well have ſaid, therefore we conclude a Man is juſtified by the deeds of a Law, and it had been a more probable concluſion, ſeeing he juſt before had mentioned the Law of Faith, by which might be underſtood only the Nature and Ordination of Faith, as a receptive Grace of the objective Grace of Juſtification: It is plain, the Apoſtle hath not the leaſt intention to underſtand the Fruit of Faith, nor Faith as a Work of a Law, for if he had, he would not have ſaid ſo poſitively, therefore we conclude that a Man is juſtified by Faith, without the deeds of a Law; and its impoſſible to ſpeak any thing as oppoſites, if theſe are not ſo ſpoken, they are not ſpoken as *diverſa*, but one is affirmed of the Subject, and the other abſolutely denyed, a Man cannot be juſtified by Faith in the Apoſtles ſence, and by Works at once; but if Faith juſtifie as works, then Works and Faith are the ſame in the Apoſtles ſenſe, and to be juſtified by Faith and by Works the ſame, and ſo the Apoſtle ſpeaks non-ſenſe.

Arg. 2. *That which excludes Works of a Law in Juſtification, is oppoſed to Works of a Law in Juſtification; but Faith excludes Works of a Law in Juſtification:* Ergo, and *Minor*, Its the Law, Nature and Ordination of Faith to exclude Works, or it ſelf as a Work, yea, Faith becomes uſeleſs in Juſtification, its abdicated from Juſtification, if it puts in as a work of a Law, yet it cannot be a Goſpel work, nor can any other work be ſo, that puts in for Juſtification; it is impoſſible any thing ſhould have a jot of Goſpel in it, that is a deed of a Law for Juſtification, it is a legal work, it makes it ſo. It is the greateſt contradiction in the world to ſay, we are juſtified by our Goſpel works.

Again, to prove the *Minor* further, *That which excludes the deeds of a law by an eſſential property, is oppoſite to works; but the law, nature or ordination of faith excludes the deeds of a law by an eſſential property, viz. boaſting in claiming the reward for the work done*; this faith, or the law of faith doth, it renounceth all ſelf-righteouſneſs, and renounceth it ſelf; as ſuch it comes to Chriſt, and for his righteouſneſs, naked and empty; its not true faith unleſs it be ſo, unleſs it take Chriſt only for himſelf, and his righteouſneſs alone to Juſtification.

§. 20. Arg. 3. *Faith alſo is oppoſed to works*, Rom. 4. 5. *where the righteouſneſs of faith is imputed to him that worketh not, but is ungodly*; there faith is oppoſed to works, but in the Juſtification of *Abraham* it was ſo, and is ſo in every Believer, according to the Apoſtle, for Juſtification cannot be there by faith as a work, for then it were falſe to ſay, *righteouſneſs is imputed to him that worketh not*, viz. *for Juſtification*; for if faith juſtifieth as a work, then God juſtifieth him that worketh.

Arg. 4. *If faith and works in the point of Juſtification evacuate ove another, then they are oppoſed, but faith and works do thus evacuate each other*, Ergo, &c. The *conſequence* cannot be denied, where one deſtroys another they cannot be together in the ſame ſubject, therefore contrary; for the *Minor* the Apoſtle is clear, *Rom.* 4. 14. *if they that be of the law be heirs, i. e.* thoſe that are of the works of the law for Juſtification, κεκένωται ἡ πίστις, καὶ κατήργηται ἡ ἐπαγγελία, *faith is evacuated, and the promiſe abdicated*; for faith making it ſelf a work, is *felo de ſe*, and throws off the free promiſe, and takes the reward as Debt, and not of Grace.

§. 21. Arg. 5. *That which is not of faith in Juſtification, is oppoſed to faith in Juſtification, at leaſt* in genere diſparatorum, *but the law and deeds of it is not of faith*, i. e. *be that works for Juſtification on legal terms, is not one that's juſtified by faith:* And what's theſe terms, *the man that doth them ſhall live in them*; now then, if its of faith to ſay, I am of the works of a law, and I ſhall live

in

in my faith, becauſe its the term of a law, if ſo, the law ſhould be of faith, and faith of the law, contrary to the Apoſtle, *Galatians* 3. 12.

Arg. 6. *There's nothing more plain than the oppoſition the Apoſtle makes between Juſtification by faith and works*, Gal. 2. 16. The Apoſtle ſays it was a known thing to *Peter* and the Apoſtles, that a man is not juſtified by the works of a law (if he meant an exception of the law of faith, why did he not expreſs it) but by the faith of Jeſus; wherefore is this *Antitheſis*, if no oppoſition between faith and works in Juſtification? (he ſhould have ſaid in the *Neonomian* ſenſe, knowing we are not juſtified by the works of a law, but by the works of the law of faith.) we have believed in Jeſus Chriſt, that we might be juſtified by the faith of Chriſt (now leaſt any ſhould ſay, this faith in Chriſt is a work of the new law) he ſaith, *and not by the works of a law, for in thy ſight ſhall no fleſh living be juſtified by them.* Now I pray, were any ſaved under the Old Teſtament, they will ſay preſently, yes, by the works of the New Law; nay, but the Spirit of God ſaith poſitively, *no fleſh living* was ever juſtified, no not by a new law. VVill any man dare then to venture his Juſtification upon works of a law old or new? Doth the Apoſtle ſay, we have believed in Jeſus that we may be juſtified by the works of the law of faith? So he ſhould have ſaid to have expreſſed his meaning in theſe mens ſence: *No*, he ſaith, to prevent all miſtakes in this kind, *not by the work of a law*, and he proves it: And he adds, for Conviction of *Peter* of his Error in complying with the *Judaizing* Chriſtians, *if we*, i. e. you and I, *ſeek to be juſtified by Chriſt, we are worſe, are found tranſgreſſors*, by endeavouring by our practice to build People up in Juſtification by their own righteouſneſs, the works of a law, which we have deſtroyed by our Miniſtry.

§. 22. Arg. 7. *The oppoſition is full*, Rom. 2. 20, 21, 22. *where the righteouſneſs of a law is directly oppoſed to the righteouſneſs of faith as two righteouſneſſes oppoſite in Juſtification*; there is an oppoſition: But in the Juſtification of a ſinner, the righteouſneſs of faith and works are ſo oppoſed in the ſaid place for *by the righteouſneſs of a law*, he ſaid, *ſhall no fleſh living be juſtified in the ſight of God*, he ſhould have added his exception, if he had intended men were to be juſtified by the righteouſneſs of the new law, and his reaſon is, that *by a law is the knowledge of ſin*, *i. e.* conviction of ſin, but no remedy; for the law only makes a ſinner guilty before God and his own Conſcience; but how then juſtified? *Anſw.* It is by another righteouſneſs (the gift of God) which we have not performed, but which is received by

faith, therefore called *the righteousness of God which is by faith*, [without our law-performances] but the righteousness of Christ who fulfilled the law, this is that which is in and upon every Believer; *But*, saith Mr. *Cl. I infer, we are not justified by the active righteousness of Christ* (p. 46.) *or his obedience to the law of works imputed to us*—— *for then we are justified by the law or Covenant of works*, &c.

Resp. The same inference will hold if only the passive obedience of Christ be imputed; for what was that but fulfilling the Covenant of Works in Satisfaction. All that Christ did or suffered was obedience to *the Covenant of Works*, and his righteousness is justifying to us before God *in foro legis*, the difference of Law and Gospel lying here, in the Covenant of Grace, *That our righteousness for Justification is not of our own performance of obedience to the law*, for that is legal only; but our Gospel-righteousness is Christ's perfect performance of the most legal righteousness, and this freely bestowed on us, and received by faith.

CHAP. XII.

Of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness.

Section 1. *Mr.* H. *insists on Justification by Works.* §. 2. *He saith, the Imputation of Christ's righteousness is not found in Scripture.* §. 3. *His Third Argument against Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.* §. 4. *Of Imputation of Christ's passive Obedience.* §. 5. *How far his Argument agrees with* Socinus. §. 6. *He seeks to avoid the* Socinian *Rock.* §. 7. *Active and passive Obedience of Christ imputed.* §. 8. *His further inference.* §. 9. *Christ came to procure a New Law.* §. 10. *Of the* Protestant's *Appeal.*

Sect. 1. I Shall here take Mr. *H.* in hand, because I find he is most positive in the denial of it upon all accounts, only he tells us of imputation of effects, which are not imputable, and

and besides is a total denial of Imputation of Christ's Righteousness it self. His Arguments are 1. Taken from the places of Scripture that seem to evince the imputation of our own righteousness to us for Justification. VVhat he saith of *boasting* and *merit* hath bin spoken to already, the latter he doth after many *Good Morrows*, in a manner grant, whereby his Doctrine is eradicated by the Apostle, He tells us, *the large extent of Christ's righteousness to all the world in procurement of a law of Grace*, which Doctrine I have shewed the absurdity and vanity of elsewhere. *It is manifest in Scripture* (Mediocr. p. 20.) *that good works, holy duties, and performances are accepted of God and rewarded.*

Resp. It is true, but acceptation of good works doth not prove justification of their persons by them, nor the rewarding them; for *Abel*'s person being justified by faith, his services were also accepted in the same righteousness he was justified by, and rewarded graciously in Christ; yea, his works were witnessed to by God before the World; but such approbation of works as the fruits of faith, is not Justification in God's sight, in the strict eye of his Justice. That place of *Matth.* 19.17. *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments*, where Christ answers him according to the true tenor of his question, which was, *what good may I do that I may inherit eternal life?* Mr. *H.* and Mr. *Cl.* must needs say, that he sought for righteousness by an old-law righteousness, which doth appear by Christ's Answer and his Reply. Indeed the whole of Christ's Discourse seems clearly to evince that Christ confuted his Confidence in his own righteousness, and convinced him of it, because Christ gave him a Command that put him to the *non-plus*, and sent him away sorrowful, and therefore is no proof of Justification, for he was not *justified* The Apostle, *Rom.* 2. 7. speaks after the tenor of the Covenant of Works, which requires perseverance in good works, not at all of works or doing, as justifying righteousness; that of 2 *Tim.* 4. 7, 8. speaks of Gods acceptation of the services of the Apostles, and rewarding them in Christ, but nothing of his righteousness for Justification, which was Christ's only that he desired to be found in; that of *Matth.* 25.34. hath the same import, *come ye blessed*, &c. it holds only God's owning and declaring the acceptance of the works and services of the Saints, as performed by faith in Christ alone for the accepting their Persons and Services; besides, it appears sufficiently by the context, they never brought their works to account for *Justification*. He brings in also *Ezek.* 18.26,27. which is as little to the purpose. The Lord there answers a charge the People had against him, in not deal-

ing uprightly, equally and juſtly with them, *v.* 25. which the Lord anſwers, That he always had and would deal with them that ſtood upon their own righteouſneſs according to the tenor of the law; if you are able to ſtand the teſt of your own righteouſneſs you ſhall be tried by it, yea, I will deal not only righteouſly with you according to my law, but condeſcendingly, if you are able to turn from ſin to righteouſneſs, and abide in it, and not turn to ſin again, but all this is to ſhew them their folly in truſting to their own righteouſneſs and ability to perform it, for he ſaith, *v.* 31. *caſt away all your tranſgreſſions, i. e.* there's not the guilt of any muſt ly upon you, *and make you a new heart, and a new ſpirit*; where he challengeth them to do that which no natural man can do; but becauſe they ſtood upon their own righteouſneſs and natural abilities, God brings them to the teſt for their Conviction, that they might fly to his Grace both for Juſtification and Sanctification, which fully appears by the Promiſe, *chap* 36. 25, 26, 27. where both are ſaid to be of God, and not of our ſelves. He alledgeth alſo the tenor of the Law, *he that doth them ſhall live in them, i. e.* ſaith he, *he ſhall be juſtified in them.*

Reſp. Now its ſtrange a man ſhould be ſo abſurd to bring the expreſs tenor of the Covenant of Works to be that of the Covenant of Grace, when its poſitively affirmed, that this tenor of the law is not of faith, directly oppoſed to that righteouſneſs of faith, *Gal.* 3. 12. Nay, he is not content with this downright contradiction to the Spirit of God, he goes on, *If you make a queſtion, there is another Text muſt convince you, The juſt ſhall live by faith, to live by our faith is to be juſtified by it.*

Reſp. The man, I ſuppoſe, ſaid theſe things by roat, not minding the Text, he ſays there's another Text, but names not where, but its applied to the matter in hand, *Gal.* 3. 11. the very reciting whereof will be anſwer enough to him. The Apoſtle was proving, *a man is not juſtified by the works of the law,* [perfectly or imperfectly performed] *is evident, for the juſt ſhall live by faith,* i. e. he that is righteous, is righteous by the righteouſneſs of faith, and this is the righteouſneſs which his faith, as its food, feeds upon during his life of Juſtification.

§. 2. His ſecond Argument is, (*Mediоc. p.* 19, 20.) *When this very Phraſe of the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs is not found in Scripture.* So ſaith Mr. *Cl.*

Reſp. That imputation of righteouſneſs is found in Scripture, it cannot be denied, as in the inſtance of *Abraham, Rom.* 4. Now our adverſaries will grant us this Dilemma. that either it was Chriſt's righteouſneſs was imputed to him, or his own, not

his

his own, becauſe he was ungodly when juſtified, for *when he was ungodly*, ſaith the Text, *faith was imputed to him for righteouſneſs*; what of faith? ſure it was no other than the thing he believed, *Jeſus Chriſt and his righteouſneſs, whoſe day of expiation he ſaw*, this was imputed to him for righteouſneſs. For if *Abraham* ſaw Chriſt's day, it was the day of his Sacrifice and Expiation; for this end he came into the world, and the Good News or Goſpel preached unto him was Chriſt in the Promiſe, *Gal.* 3.8. *and the ſame righteouſneſs the heathen was to be juſtified by, Ibid.* Faith wherever its ſaid to be accounted for righteouſneſs, or wherever we are ſaid to be accounted righteous, its to be underſtood objectively, and put for the righteouſneſs that it does eye and lay hold upon. But 2*dly*, Is not Chriſts righteouſneſs ſaid in Scripture to be imputed to us? let us a little examine Scripture: Firſt, whether its not in *Rom.* 4. where Imputation is often mentioned. The Apoſtle *Rom.*4.21,22. obſerves *Abraham believing the promiſe*, viz. *of Chriſt*, ſaith, *therefore it was imputed to him for righteouſneſs*, viz. the thing *promiſed*, and the thing *believed*, *for he believed that God was able to perform what he promiſed*, therefore the thing promiſed was that which was imputed to him. Now ſaith the Apoſtle, do not believe you are told this, becauſe it was peculiar to *Abraham*, and none had it but *Abraham*, *but its written not for him only*, *but for us*, that have the ſame Faith, Righteouſneſs and Imputation, *to us to whom it ſhall be imputed if we believe*, i. e. *receive that righteouſneſs by faith* which *Abraham* received, *embracing the promiſes*, viz. believing on him that juſtifies, and on the righteouſneſs of Chriſt by which we are juſtified; and then the Argument ſtands thus, *The death of Chriſt for our ſins, and reſurrection for Juſtification, is the righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, this none can deny, *but the death of Chriſt for our ſins, and his reſurrection for or becauſe of our Juſtification, is imputed to every believer*, as is plain in the Text. *chap.* 4. 24, 25. and hence it follows, that all the Juſtification ſpoken of, and imputation of righteouſneſs, throughout the *Chapter*, is *Chriſts righteouſneſs*, the Apoſtle aſſerting here and *Gal.* 3. that *the Gentiles ſhould be juſtified by faith as Abraham was.*

3. The Scripture ſaith we are juſtified by his blood, *Rom.* 5. 9. *and through faith in his blood*, *Rom.*4.28. therefore, *They that be juſtified by the blood of Chriſt*, *are juſtified by the imputation of his righteouſneſs*, *but we are ſo juſtified*, by the places mentioned. Now then, none can deny that Chriſts ſhedding his blood is his righteouſneſs, and we cannot be juſtified by it unleſs it be imputed to us, and if any thing elſe be imputed, then not that; if Mr.

Humph.

Humph. will say, its effective only, its ἐν τῷ αἵματι, *in his blood.* as in the blood of a Sacrifice shed for us, where in the blood of the Sacrifice is accepted, as if it were the very blood of the Sinner.

4th. That by which we have redemption is the righteousness of Christ, but the death and satisfaction of Christ is that whereby we have redemption, and therefore that redeeming righteousness is imputed to us, Rom 3. 25, 26. Col. 4. 14. but more of this by and by, for the Scripture is full of it, blessed be God. *Neonomian* Doctrine, I am fully assured, is far from Gospel, as far as Darkness is from Light.

§. 3. His third Argument against the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, is, *If the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us* (as if it were ours in it self) *it must be the righteousness of his active or passive obedience, or both, But its neither.*

Resp. We say both: He goes to prove his active obedience is not imputed, *if it be, then must we be looked upon in him as having committed no Sin, nor omitted no Duty, and then what need will there be of Christ's Death?*

Resp. The same *consequent* may be corruptly drawn upon imputation of his passive, as he doth: But the *consequent* follows not, for the Imputation of Christs active obedience, is upon supposal that the Law of God is not, nor cannot be perfectly kept by us; for if we were perfect in our selves, there would not need the Perfection of another to be imputed to us; for all Imputation by Transaction, supposeth the person not to be that personally, and in himself, which he is made to be by Imputation; so Imputation of our Sins to Christ, supposeth Christ was not Sin in himself, but made so by imputation of ours; therefore the Imputation of Christs active obedience supposeth us to be sinners in our selves, 2. As Christ was the *Second Adam,* and made under the law in all respects for us, so he was to come under it for us as to active obedience, and to answer that way as well as the other, for it was needful that he *fulfil all righteousness for us*; and the first and chief thing the Law required, was active obedience; the Law is not satisfied without a performance of the righteousness which it requires; there must be therefore a fulfilling of the Law as to active obedience, else the righteousness of Christ is lame and imperfect. Its true, if the righteousness imputed were inherent, according to the *Neonomian* Doctrine, then the inference might hold; if we are imputed righteous for our internal righteousness, that would bring us under this consequence; but our Imputation is of the active righteousness of another, which makes us compleat in Christ, and without spot in the eye of God's Justice.

Let

Let me return the Argument upon him, *If our active obedience to the new Law be imputed to us for justifying righteousness, then must we be lookt upon in this righteousness as such as have committed no sin.* I hope Mr. *H.* will not say, that the righteousness of the new law is not active obedience: I say, is it imputed or not? if imputed, the consequence follows, but to see the baseness of these men, to draw odious consequences upon the Mystery of Christ, when the same would follow with much more odium upon their own Doctrine that they set up against Christ, their active obedience must be imputed to them for righteousness, but Christ's must not be imputed to us. They say then, what need would there be of Christ's Death? We say, as much as there is of paying the wages of sin where the law is actually broken: The law requires two things, 1. The death of the sinner. 2. The obedience of the sinner to the preceptive part of the law, both which Christ hath performed, and a Believer in him, as his Representative, Priest and Surety; and whereas he saith *we must be looked upon as such as have committed no sin*; we must not be lookt upon as such by our selves; but there is no true Believer but is lookt upon by God *in foro Justitiæ*, as if he had committed no sin; for if our sins stand in the light of God's Countenance, in the eye of his Justice, we must needs be odious to him, whence is it then that the sins of Gods children are cast behind his back, and that they stand without spot before the Throne; and to conclude this Point, now let him consider only one *verse* of *Rom.* 5. 19. *As by the disobedience of one many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one many shall be made righteous.* I would know of him what will become of so plain an *Antithesis*, if obedience be not active obedience there meant.

§. 4. *If Christs passive obedience be imputed, then must we look on our selves as such who in Christ have suffered and satisfied the law, and born the curse of it, and then how shall there be room for any pardon? a man that pays his full debt by himself or Surety cannot be forgiven by the Creditor.*

Resp. And here he would cover himself not to be seen a *Socinian*; we shall see how well by and by. 1. He lays it down as a gross absurdity to say, *we satisfied in Christ*, here and elsewhere often, to which we answer, that it is not absurd for any man to say, I paid my Debt by another, *viz.* a Surety, for the law looks upon it as the payment of his Debt, and he is discharged by it. 2. He makes not himself the Surety, for he ascribes the payment to the Surety, and the Debt to himself; so the words are not honouring himself, but honour to the Surety, therefore to say, Believers have satisfied the law in their Surety Christ, is giving *glo-*

ry

ry to him, and a proper uſual Speech. But he infers with the *Socinians*, that then there's no room for Pardon; indeed it is eaſie to ſee how their mouths water at a plain Denial of Chriſt's Satisfaction, though they do it interpretatively as much as the *Socinians*; you may likewiſe ſee the Deſign in dividing Juſtification and Pardon one from the other. Its true, when a righteous perſon is juſtified by his own righteouſneſs (as in the *Neonomian* Juſtification) there's no room for Pardon, for he hath paid all his due, and by his own Money; but it is otherwiſe in God's Juſtification of a ſinner.

1. That is his Pardon, God pardons none but in Juſtification, *we have forgiveneſs through the blood of Chriſt*, tho Man pardons often with injury to Juſtice, but *God declares his righteouſneſs for the remiſſion of ſins*, Rom. 3.25. and *without ſhedding of blood there is no remiſſion*, *Heb.* 9.

2. God's juſtifying ſinners, ungodly, &c. by a righteouſneſs given unto them, is a pardon of them.

3. It is the higheſt, nobleſt Pardon in the World, where ſins are nailed to the Croſs of Chriſt, when it is to the Satisfaction of Juſtice, as Grace, ſo Juſtice are magnified therein: A true Believer, and broken-hearted ſinner will not ſpeak in the proud *Socinian* or *Neonomian* Dialect, *O Lord, we thank thee not for, or expect Pardon, if Chriſt hath died to ſatisfie*; with them, either Gods Pardon, or the Sinners Juſtification muſt fall to the ground; but bleſs God for the nobleſt Pardon in the World.

§. 5. But methinks this Argument is purely *Socinian*, for they ſay, *there's nothing more contrary to Gods forgiving freely than Satisfaction*: But Mr. *H.* that he might not ſeem to run a Tilt againſt Satisfaction, ſaith indeed. *The Argument of the* Socinian *from Pardon againſt Chriſt's Satisfaction is not valid, but it is good againſt imputation of it to us, as if we had ſatisfied.*

Reſp. And why is it not good againſt *Satisfaction* in the *Socinian* ſence? he gives no reaſon, for he ſaith, that he that pays the full Debt by himſelf or Surety, there's no room for pardon; and will not Mr. *H.* ſay, that Chriſt hath not paid the full Debt for him; if he will, let him pay what remains, or try for Pardon for that which is not paid another way than by remiſſion through his blood; but what do they *Socinians* ſay more; if God be ſatisfied where is Pardon? we ſay, God's Pardon is by way of Satisfaction to his Law; No, ſaith Mr. *H.* it is good againſt Imputation, ſo the *Socinians* hold too. I pray, did Chriſt ſatisfie at all? if he did, was it in a law-ſence? if ſo, was it for himſelf, or for us? if for us, then the law ſaith ſo, for us: For the Law of God doth not take Satisfaction in ſo blind a manner, as that God in his

Law

Law knows not for whom it is; if God in his Law knows for whom it is, and accepts it for us, then it is accounted to us, and imputed to us, as to all the ends thereof in Law. The taking Satisfaction in Law for any offence against it for any one, is the Laws Imputation or accounting it to him for whom it is made, whether the satisfaction be given by himself who transgressed, or any one for him; therefore if Christ satisfied for us, and this Satisfaction accepted by God for us, God imputes it to us, as if we had done it our selves, therefore Mr. *H.* must either renounce the Doctrine *of Satisfaction*, with the *Socinians*, or own its imputed to us as fully (yea in this case we may say) more fully than if we had made it our selves.

§. 6. Let us see how Mr. *H.* would avoid the *Socinian* Rock, he saith, *Christ may have wrought with the father (or made him that satisfaction as) to procure new Terms, so that a man may be justified as a fulfiller of them, and yet need pardon for non-performance of the old.*

R. Behold the *Neonomian* Satisfaction! 1. He makes not Satisfaction a payment of a Debt owing to the Law by us, but only a procurement. a buying something of God, whereas Satisfaction is for a wrong done. I may purchase a thing of a person whom I never injur'd, or if I have the Money whereby I purchase a new thing that refers not to the injury I did before, but to the new Purchace; observe then, he makes Christ's Satisfaction only a New Purchace.

2. This New Purchace is of New Terms of Justification; hence God is not to stand upon satisfaction to the Old Law, but to drop it, and bring the Sinner under a New Law; Christ died not to satisfie the Law, but to translate us from one Law to another, whence the old hath no more to do with us, and thus all the world are translated, therefore the Old Law is gone to all the World unsatisfied.

3. A Man is justified on the new Terms, they being fulfilled by his own righteousnes, but not pardoned on these terms by the New Law; and this is one of the greatest inconsistencies in the World, to say a man is justified by a Law, and not pardoned; how is he just in the eye of that Law that doth not free from the charge of any transgression of it, But

3. He saith, he needs Pardon for non-performance of the old, if so, 1. The New Law is not an Act of Indemnity in respect of sins against the old; for if a man condemned by one law, be taken from under it to a new law, he is indempnified from the old, else all pretence of advantage by the said translation is gone, for he that stands under the terms of one law, condemned by it,

and

and brought under new terms to another, come now to be liable to the laſh of two Laws, whereas before he was under but one.

2. He ſaith, *this Pardon muſt be had at the Bar of the Old Law.* I would know of Mr. *H.* how? If he ſaith, and will ſtand to it according to his own Argument, he cannot. or elſe he muſt deny Chriſts Satisfaction, which is this, *That Law which is ſatisfied for the breach of it, admits no Pardon from the Legiſlator, but the Old Law* (ſay *Neonomians* in words) *was ſatisfied for us, therefore there can be no Pardon; yea, it was ſatisfied for us in our ſtead, and the ſatisfaction accepted for us, yea therefore imputed to us,* Here I have the *Neonomian* faſt in this Dilemma from their own Doctrine, let them free themſelves how they can. For if Pardon and Satisfaction imputed are not conſiſtent as to our Doctrine. then not in theirs; but they ſay, notwithſtanding their juſtification by their New Law, they muſt have Pardon for the breach of the Old, and how? Not at all in their ſence, if the Old be not ſatisfyed, or that Satisfaction not imputed; as much as to ſay, it is Money laid down in Court indefinitely, but not accepted in Court for this and that Mans Sins; hence Chriſt hath ſatisfyed for none, for all ſatisfaction as ſuch, is accepted as ſuch; we come now to his attempt, to prove that neither the Active or Paſſive Obedience of Chriſt is imputed.

§. 7. *For* (ſaith he) *If that his Active and Paſſive Obedience be imputed, then muſt God be made to deal with Man according to the Covenant of Works.*

Reſp. See how this Gentleman in all his Arguings runs his Head againſt a Poſt and Pillar of Goſpel Truth, his Argument is this, if Chriſt's Active and Paſſive Obedience be accepted for us as ſatisfaction for the Law, then God deals with Sinners in their juſtification, after the tenor of the Covenant of Works; now he may aſſume either by taking away the *Antecedent*, or by taking away the *Conſequent*, he indeed intends both, firſt, by taking away the *Antecedent*, viz. But Chriſt's Active and Paſſive Obedience is not accepted for ſatisfaction, therefore he doth not deal with Sinners in Juſtification according to the Covenant of Works, therefore Chriſt hath not ſatisfied the Covenant of Works for us, the Law lies unſatisfyed. I would know how the Pardon he ſpeaks of is Subſequent to the New Law. Juſtification is had, is it by dealing with us upon the account of ſatisfaction to the Old Law? He ſuggeſts that it is, then pardoned Sinners are dealt with according to the Old Law, if not juſtified. But to have him in his Conſequences, he aſſumes that God deals not with Sinners in Juſtification upon the Terms of the Old Law, or Covenant of Works. To Anſwer, he deals with them

in

in Chriſt, according to the Terms of the Covenant of Works, but in themſelves as ſinners, juſtifying them in Chriſt according to the Tenor of the Covenant of Works, it is meer Grace, the Myſtery of Grace is to ſave ſinners in ſuch a way, as may not only magnifie rich Grace, but Exalt Grace, and that in the higheſt manner. Now the Exaltation of Juſtice cannot be but in the juſtifying a Sinner in the Eye of the ſtricteſt Law, by the higheſt and moſt acceptable Satisfaction thereof, on this account, Chriſts Obedience was the moſt Legal, both active and paſſive that ever was; but that a ſinner is brought under this Obedience of Chriſt unto Juſtification, is meer free Grace, he being thereby partaker of the diſtinguiſhing Grace of God, and the free Gift of Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs, without the intervention of any Mediator, or Subordinate Righteouſneſs of his own; hence it is, that his Faith makes not void the Law, but Eſtabliſheth it in the higheſt degree, in Exalting Chriſt as his only, and moſt compleat Righteouſneſs, moſt legal in ſatisfying the Law for us, as a Covenant of Works; he ſaith, *when nothing is more apparent in Scripture then that by Grace it is that we are juſtified, and by Grace ſaved.*

Reſp. But will *Mr. H.* affirm that Grace doth juſtifie us without Juſtice? Doth not the Apoſtle ſay a ſinner is juſtifyed by Grace, in and through Chriſts Redemption, that God may be juſt? Doth not Mr. *H.* ſay Juſtification is an Act of Juſtice, again and again? Doth not this ſetting up our own righteouſneſs in performance of the Condition of the New Law, make his Juſtification an Act of Juſtice, yea, and without Grace? What do theſe Men mean ſo often and poſitively to contradict the Scripture and themſelves, to draw their dirty Inferences upon the Truth, with holding it in unrighteouſneſs?

§. 8. *If nothing leſs then a Righteouſneſs as doth Anſwer and ſatisfie the Law fully, will ſuffice for the ſinners Plea to flee from Condemnation, he is not judged by the Law of Grace, but by the Law of Works.*

R. The inference hath no danger in it; for 1. We know of no Judgment in freeing any from Condemnation, but a Diſcharge in Chriſt from the Law of Works, before which every Believer is diſcharged here and hereafter through Grace.

2. We know of no New Law, either to quit or condemn, a Law of Grace in that ſenſe is a Bull, Grace and a Law are directly oppoſite. 2. He here inſinuates as if Chriſts ſatisfaction were compleat and imperfect: If nothing elſe will ſuffice for a Plea. 1. What can be better than a perfect ſatisfaction for a Plea. 2. Either Chriſts is not perfect, or elſe perfect will not do, without an imperfect added to it, which indeed he means, that

that Chriſts perfect ſatisfaction muſt have our Imperfect added, to make our Plea compleat. 3. What is freeing from condemnation but Pardon of Sin? I pray, what righteouſneſs doth a *Neonomian* flee to for the pardon of Sin? Do they tell us its Chriſts, tho' they be juſtified by their own? I would know whether they eſteem Chriſts Righteouſneſs full and compleat for the pardon of Sin? Or do they plead for ſome of their pardon at the Bar of the New Law, where they are juſtifyed, and ſome of their pardon at the Bar of the Old Law, where they are condemned? But this imputed righteouſneſs is a miſtake of the *Proteſtants* (poor Man I pitty him) and he hath found the miſtake, ſo it ſeems indeed by his Writing.

§. 8. *Chriſt came into the World to procure and tender a New Law, and in this regard he is called our Law giver; not that he hath given any other Moral rules of Life to us, but that he hath given the ſame Precepts, with Indulgence.*

Reſp. Now mark the *Neonomian* Spirit, but Two or Tree Lines off he was for Juſtification only by Grace without Law, that he might dethrone Chriſt, but now again, that he may Enthrone Mans Righteouſneſs, he is altogether for Law, his Language is half Aſhdod, take him where you will. 1. He tells you what he means by Satisfaction, which he ſaith is procurement, Chriſt came into the World not to ſatisfie the Law of God, which we had broken, but to procure a Law, a remedial Law, a better Law to anſwer Gods Ends than the Firſt; it was a great miſtake ſure in Divine Wiſdom to make ſuch a Law at firſt as would not do. 2. It was another overſight at leaſt that Chriſt did not come to procure a right law at firſt. 3. Its very ſtrange that God would not afford a right law without procurement, Laws are not uſed to be purchaſed or procured; Legiſlators make Laws according to their pleaſure, without procurement. 4. And wh t's the World the better? Chriſt hath procured the putting the World under New-Law Terms, and not ſatisfied the Old Law, and now they muſt perform the condition of the New Law, and be pardoned by the old Law unſatisfied, elſe they cannot be ſaved. 5. After all the noiſe about ſaving by Grace, its but by a law which requires perſonal obedience in fulfilling the condition; this is the Grace of the Law, and Law of Grace; a Law of Grace it is, ſuch wherein Grace is no more Grace, and the Law is no more a Law, that indeed a law of Grace is a Contradiction in *proprio adjuncto*, a meer Hobgoblin. But how is theſe mens New Law compounded? It is, they ſay, of Grace and a Law; and it lies *In that he hath not given new Moral Laws of life to us, other than what was contained in the old law before; but that he hath given the ſame precepts with indulgence.* *Anſw.*

Answ. Well, Christ is not our Lawgiver according to purchase (for these Men make Christ to have died for himself, to make himself a Lawgiver) to devise and constitute any new Moral Precepts, but first to pluck down the old house, and then to take the broken and scattered pieces, and make a new one; he takes the Moral Materials of the old Law, cuts and hews them pretty much, makes the Duties more indifferent, the sins forbidden Venial and allowable, yea necessary, to come into the righteousness of the new law; for if the Condition be not mixt of Morality and Immorality its good for nothing, it will not serve this turn, therefore the old law with indulgence of sin is the New Law. I pray let me know from the Wits of our Age, whether this be not *Antinomianism?* Now he tells us, *this is a law of indulgence*, &c. the plain *English* of it is, that its a Law of Dispensation with a Law of Justice, *i. e.* a lawless law; that all the Satisfaction he means, is Gods Dispensation with Law and Justice, and a law to call Sin by one law Sin, and righteousness by another; the truth is, the whole Doctrine tends to deny God in his glorious Properties, and to change him into *the similitude of an Ox that eateth Hay*, *interpretativè*, and if God doth not act now, and at Judgment, by this lay of Dispensation with Law, and indulgence of Sin, he says, the main business of Christ's coming and Redemption, is lost, that can be no other in his sence than to be Minister of Sin.

§. 10. *You shall hear a* Protestant [i. e. *Neonomians*, they are *Papists*, according to the Profession of this downright *Papist*] *in his Prayer, appealing from the Tribunal of Gods Justice, to the Throne of his Grace, yet in his Sermon telling the People, that it is nothing else but the perfect obedience and satisfaction of Christ imputed to them that saves them, which is to bring them back from the throne of Grace to the Bar of his Justice to be judged.*

Resp. I am ashamed to read such a Banter of Christianity from any man that professeth himself a Christian, tho a *Papist* and *Socinian.* 1. Is it a good Appeal or no for a sinner to make from the Tribunal of Justice, *i. e.* meer Justice, where God beholds the Sinner as he is in himself, by his most righteous law, a condemned transgressor, to the Throne of Grace (not that God hath two Thrones, *Rev.* 4.) but from it proceeds a Dispensation of Justice, Thundrings, Lightnings, &c. of Judicial Proceedings to his enemies, and a Dispensation of Grace to his Church, (there being a Rainbow round about the Throne;) where Christ is a High-Priest, who hath satisfied the Justice of God, and pleading his Satisfaction as our Advocate and Intercessor? did not *David* do so, *Psalm* 51. 2. Is it not good Doctrine, and agreeable to the Appeal, to tell the People that nothing else but the per-

fect Obedience and Satisfaction of Christ imputed to them can save them: Is this to bring them back to the Tribunal of meer Justice? is not this the Throne of Grace where Justice is satisfied and appeased, where Christ the Satisfier is exalted to Gods right hand *to be a Prince and Saviour?*

I pray, what do *Neonomians*? do they first bring them to a law, suppose it were a law of Grace, as they call it, to be justified by their own righteousness; whither do they carry them then? is it not to the Tribunal of Justice to be pardoned? So that if God in Christ pardoning iniquity on the Throne of Grace, through the Satisfaction of Christ, be the Throne of Justice divested of Grace: Why are *Neonomians* to be pardoned there, after they are justified at another Bar? But he is for the dividing *Grace* and *Justice* in a Sinner's Justification, as the *Socinians* are, or rather abandoning Justice.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Righteouſneſs of God.

Section 1. *Works of a Law not Goſpel.* §. 2. *Mr.* H. *outdone the Papiſts.* §. 3. *The Righteouſneſs of God what?* §. 4. *An offer at Faiths being our ſubordinate Righteouſneſs.* §. 5. *Mr.* Cl. *and Mr.* H. *Sence of the Righteouſneſs of God.* §. 6. *Their Reaſons given and Anſwered.* §. 7. *Mr.* Cl. *Reaſons why it is not Chriſts Righteouſneſs,* 2 Cor. 5. 21. §. 8. *His ſecond Reaſon.* §. 9. *A diſtinct Conſideration of the ſaid Texts.* §. 10. *Chriſts Righteouſneſs is the Righteouſneſs of God.* §. 11. §. 12. *Rom.* 3. 21, 22. *examin'd.* §. 13. *Rom.* 10. 3. §. 14. *Mr.* H. *Explication of* Rom. 10. 4. *examin'd.* §. 15. *Mr.* H. *Explication of* 2 Cor. 5. 21. *Examin'd. And* §. 16. *What he further ſaith on the Place examin'd.*

§. 1. IN the laſt Place, *There is a Righteouſneſs revealed in the Goſpel, that God goes by in his dealing with all the World, whereby it is that we are Juſtified in Oppoſition to the Righteouſneſs of Works.*

Reſp. If it be a revealed Righteouſneſs, it's that which is the Object of Faith ſeen without our ſelves not in our ſelves, for that need not to be revealed, which every Man is naturally addicted to ſee and know. Again, it muſt not be our Works in Oppoſition to our Works for Juſtification, for there is no formal Oppoſition between Works and Works, nor material indeed which have the ſame Subject, and Genus, and End; as for what he calls them by way of Difference, it will not ſerve, he calls ſome Works, Works of the Law, ſome Goſpel-works, *i. e.* Works of the Law of Grace; now we have ſhew'd that there are no ſuch Goſpel-works which put in for Juſtification, nor doth the Spirit Work ſuch, and being both are the Works of a Law, they differ not ſpecifically, they are legal Works, Works of a Law

performed for Justification are always Legal never Evangelical.

§. 2. *This Revealed Righteousness is in Scripture called the Righteousness of God, which the* Protestants *conceive to be the Righteousness of Christ without us* [*all but* Neonomians *and* Quakers] *i. e. the Righteousness of Christ, which is not ours by Performance but by Faith, but neither* Protestants *since* Luther, *nor* Papists *since* Augustine, *have hit the Mind of the Apostle.*

Resp. But the Scripture hath hit it long before *Luther*, sure then, if they were not Right, the Reformation was the Deformation in Doctrine; the Truth is, many of the *Protestants* were out in this Point; all our Reformation so far as I can understand Mr. *H.* and many *Neonomians* are gone, is not worth a Fig; and here indeed Mr. *H.* boasts again and again, that he hath outdone the *Papists*; and I may truly say, that he and his Father *B.* hath, and in this only they differ from the *Papists*, that they go beyond them in Self-righteousness, and in a most daring scornful Opposition to the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ.

§. 3. *The Righteousness of God and Grace opposed to Works, is nothing but the Righteousness of the Covenant of Grace accepted for Christs sake, instead of the Covenant of Works.*

Resp. It is not Christ's Righteousness accepted for us, for that alone is the Righteousness of the Covenant of Grace, and then only God did not set up Christ to set up our Righteousness, because it was impossible for us to have any other to be justified by, that he might have the Glory of Being our Righteousness alone, but he saith, this Righteousness of ours must come instead of the Righteousness of the Covenant of Works; to which we Answer, that its impossible for us to be Justified by any Righteousness, but that which fully and exactly answers the Covenant of Works, either our own, or anothers, the Righteousness of another Law cant Justifie us there. For if a Sinner be justified, it must be by that Law which he hath broken, and by none else; if they say Christ hath satisfied that Law for us, then we say that Satisfaction is a sufficient Righteousness for our Justification, we look for no other Law to be justified by, nor no other Righteousness for our Justification. *He proceeds, Herein are two Things comprized, the meritorious Righteousness of Christ, procuring the pardoning Covenant of Grace, and our performing the Condition, only we are to know how this Righteousness may be understood in respect to God, as it is all one with his Grace, or with respect to us as its all one upon which this Grace is vouchsafed.*

Resp. This *Neonomian* Cheat is always to be noted in the Point of Satisfaction, that all the Satisfaction they ascribe to Christ is only in making pay unto God for a new Purchase, they will not have

have Christ to have paid any Arrears or old Scores, the Law passeth away *in sententiam*, and we found insolvent to this perfect Law, therefore Christ buys another Law, upon that promiseth Justification upon easier Terms, not so Holy, but sinful and immoral, and therefore called the Law of Indulgence, yet justifies us upon those Terms, but yet without Pardon which we must have of the Old Law, and because we have fulfilled the New Law, God out of his Prerogative without any other Satisfaction than the forementioned procurement Pardons, for they say Satisfaction and Pardon are inconsistent as the *Socinians* do, and why do they say Christs Satisfaction is not imputed to us, because if they were not ashamed to speak out they think there is none, yea and that they speak of is only Christs purchasing a new Law, which would be madness for to claim an Imputation of to us, for that concerns us no further then a new Legal Bondage, if Christs Righteousness be not accepted for our Justification from the Old Law, and imputable to us, its not desirable to be imputed to us to bring us under a new Law and further Bondage. Besides, if Christ purchased this Law-making Power, its for himself, and not for us, for they will tell you he did not Purchase the Performance of the Condition, and when they say, we are justified by our Works for the sake of Christs Merits, their meaning is, because Christ purchased the Law and Promulgation of it, just as if they should say, if *Adam* had stood, he had been justified by his Works for the sake of God who made the Law, for if there had been no Law there had been no Justification by it; so we are justified say they by the Law of Grace, for the sake of Christ who merited the Law and became Law-maker; this is all they mean, and this is the *Neonomian* Cheat in the great Point of Satisfaction, whereby they would by retaining the Word, only without the Sence, cover themselves from the odious Name of *Socinians*. Lastly, He makes Grace and Justice in respect of God to be all one, so that to be justified by Works of our own, and by Grace is all one, and *Paul*'s Epistles are all Non-sense.

§. 4 Mr. *Cler.* p. 64. tells us, *He will offer his Reasons, why Faith is our subordinate Righteousness*; to the First and Second we have spoken sufficiently already. The Third is, *Because we frequently read of the Righteousness of Faith, which he saith is our Conformity to the Rule of the New-Law in sincere Believing and imperfect Doing*; the Places he mentions are, *Rom.* 4. 11, 13, *Chap.* 9. 30. *Chap.* 10. 6. *Gal.* 5. 5. *Heb.* 11. 5.

Resp. The Righteousness of Faith is the Righteousness of Christ apprehended and received by Faith, for *Rom.* 4. 11. tells us, that Circumcision was a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, which

Righteouſneſs of Faith *Abraham* had being uncircumciſed, that the ſame righteouſneſs may be imputed to them; and what righteouſneſs is that? it is that through which iniquity is forgiven, and Sin covered, that it might not be imputed, and this is the righteouſneſs that's imputed without works. Hence I argue, That that righteouſneſs through which iniquity is forgiven, and ſin covered, and is imputed without works, is the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and not ours; but the righteouſneſs of Faith, according to the Apoſtle in that place, is ſuch, as appears, *v.* 6, 7, 9, 10. Is there any iniquity forgiven in the New Law Righteouſneſs? no, they ſay, pardon is conſequent to it, its had of the old law: Is any Sin cover'd by it from the Eye of God's Juſtice? no, they ſay, God ſees their Sins by the old Law: Is righteouſneſs imputed without works? no, it cannot be, becauſe its faith as a work is imputed, *v.* 13. The Promiſe *that he ſhould be the heir of the world*, was not through a law [then not through any works of a law] *but through the righteouſneſs of faith*, therefore it was the the righteouſneſs of Chriſt; the righteouſneſs of a law is excluded, therefore works; and its here alſo what the righteouſneſs of faith apprehends. That of *Rom.* 9. 31. and *chap.* 10. 6 we ſhall ſhew by and by was the righteouſneſs of Chriſt apprehended by faith: The Apoſtle, *Gal.* 5. 5. intends Chriſt's righteouſneſs; for what ſhould men do for the hope of that righteouſneſs which they have in themſelves; for *by faith, all*, ſaith he, *are one in Chriſt Jeſus*, true faith bringing forth love, as ſuch apprehends and waits for more and more comfort in the righteouſneſs of Chriſt. That ſpoken of *Hebrews* 11. 7. is the righteouſneſs of Chriſt promiſed, *the Seed of the Woman*, that was the great Promiſe believed by the *Antidiluvian* Patriarchs, and by the Death and Satisfaction of the Seed of the Woman promiſed, they believed he *ſhould break the Serpents head*; *Noah* became heir of this righteouſneſs which he received and lived comfortably in the enjoyment of, by faith in the Promiſe.

§. 5. Mr. *Cl.* brings for a further confirmation of this Argument, thoſe places which ſpeak of the righteouſneſs of God, which they bring as a great Block in their way, and therefore take much pains to remove it: Mr. *Cl.* ſaith, *this Phraſe hath been much miſtaken by many, who have been led into error thereby*, and therefore he will endeavour to give the true ſence of it; to this purpoſe alſo Mr. *H.* we will therefore very diligently mark what they ſay. The places are, *Rom.* 1. 17. & 3. 21, 22. & 10. 3. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Phil.* 3. 9. We ſay, by the righteouſneſs of God is meant the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, but theſe men ſay, its our own inherent righteouſneſs.

Mr. *H.*

Mr. *H.* ſaith, *That our righteouſneſs is called Gods in oppoſition meerly to that of works; let a man do what he can by his own ſtrength, or by God's aid he can never come to the law of works or Moſes; God hath therefore been pleaſed to make us a new law, a law of faith, or grace, or new covenant, having lower terms, in performance whereof the ſinner, in reſpect of the law, may be righteous, its a righteouſneſs performed by Grace, which God mercifully condeſcends to accept inſtead of that which is perfect, through the merits of our Saviour, and in regard of that acceptation* (N.B.) *or this good will its called his, or the righteouſneſs which is of him.* Lo here is the true Key which opens the Mind of the Apoſtle, therefore Mr. *H.* takes it to be the new-law-righteouſneſs which in theſe places is called the righteouſneſs of God, becouſe oppoſed to the old-law-righteouſneſs, becauſe alſo wrought of God.

Mr. *Cl's* reſolution is in a manner the ſame, *That the imperfect new-law-righteouſneſs is the righteouſneſs of God becauſe it is of his Inſtitution; as for perfect obedience to the law, (which is legal righteouſneſs) that is righteouſneſs in the ſtricteſt ſence, and in ſtrict juſtice can be taken for no other, and therefore the reward muſt be debt: But that an imperfect work, ſuch as Faith and Obedience ſhould be accounted righteouſneſs, muſt ariſe from the gracious Appointment, Deſignation and Ordination of God, who hath ſet up this Way and Method of becoming righteous under the Goſpel; and hence its ſaid, reckoned, accounted, imputed for righteouſneſs, which Phraſe imports Grace and Favour, as ſome note.*

§. 6. Mr. *Cl's.* reaſons for his Opinion, are 1. *Becauſe the Phraſe of ſubmitting to the righteouſneſs* (Rom. 10.3.) *of God ſeems to import, that this is a new law, inſtitution or way naturally we are not acquainted with.*

Reſp. The Text runs quite againſt him, *being ignorant of the righteouſneſs of God*; how doth that appear? *ſeeking to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs, they ſubmitted not to* [yielded not to accept of] *the righteouſneſs of God.*

1. God's righteouſneſs and man's are here directly oppoſed to each others.

2. It is directly againſt Mr. *Cl's* reaſon, in that man need not be taught to ſet up his own righteouſneſs, they naturally adhere to it.

3. They did ſo cloſely adhere to it that they would not ſubmit to the Doctrine of Juſtification by the righteouſneſs of another, *viz. the righteouſneſs of Chriſt*; ſee how the words will run in Mr. *Cl's.* ſence, *being ignorant of an imperfect righteouſneſs of their own performing, going about to eſtabliſh a righteouſneſs of their own performing, they ſubmitted not to a righteouſneſs of their own perform-*

ing, which is Gods righteousness; besides, its not sence to say, a man submits or not to that which is his own righteousness, but it is to say, he submits to take the righteousness of another.

2. *As the righteousness of the law is that which the law requires,* Rom. 2. 26. *so this righteousness of God is that which God requires under the Gospel.*

Resp. 1. The righteousness both under the Law and Gospel is the righteousness of God; what the law requires, God by the law requires, and indeed God requires but one righteousness under the Law and Gospel, and there's the righteousness of the law, and the strictest righteousness; and if there must be a distinction between the righteousness of the Law and Gospel, as our *Neonomians* make, its most proper to call the perfect righteousness of the law, God's righteousness, it being his more than an imperfect, sinful righteousness, which would be very dishonourable to him to be called his; But Christ's Righteousness is Legal, in that it answers the Law and Gospel unto the Sinner, because it answers it for him, and his peace with God is made thereby.

3. *As the Sacrament of the Supper is called the Lord's Supper, because its his Institution, and the Lord's Day because his Designation.*

Answer, The Supper is not called *the Lord's Supper,* only because its his Institution, but because our Lord's Body and Blood is shewed forth therein to be the righteousness of God for our Justification. Neither is the *Lord's Day* so called from his Design of it, but because it is to remember the resurrection of our Lord, *who rose for our Justification,* having accomplished justifying righteousness for us. 4. Its opposed to their own righteousness, *Rom.* 10. 3. therefore not any righteousness of their own, as is already shewed, *supra,* from Rom. 10.3.

§. 7. Next let us see how Mr. *Cl.* will prove that its not the righteousness of Christ that's meant by the righteousness of God in the aforesaid places; he saith it cannot be for these reasons, *p.* 33. 1. *Because the Apostle here distinguisheth,* 2 Cor. 5. 21. *between God and Christ, the righteousness of God is one thing, and being in Christ another; whereas, if they were all one, the sence would be, that we might be made the righteousness of Christ in Christ: And* p. 65. *The Apostle also, in most places where he mentions it, distinguisheth between God and Christ,* Rom. 3. 22. Phil. 3. 9.

Resp. This Reason is so frivolous, that it needs little answer, There is no distinction at all in respect of righteousness, but an exact account thereof, that the righteousness of God, which the Apostle speaks of Christ, that which is in Christ, that the righteousness of God in Christ is that which is imputed to us; we need

need not look far to the meaning of the Apostle in the Phrase, its but in *verse* 19. *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses, i. e.* in the righteousnels of Christ God was working out reconciliation, and non-imputation of sin, and if so, imputation of Christ's righteousnels, and he saith, if the righteousnels were one, its that they might be made the righteousnels of Christ in Christ; but I pray, why may not Christs righteousnels be called the righteousnels of God, as well as our own, because they say, our own was God's Institution: Is it ours, God's and ours too? and Christs righteousnels may not be God's and Christ's too; but this reasoning is very absurd, more of this as we proceed; and as for the other places, we shall come to them by and by.

§. 8. *P.* 65. *Reason* 2. He always calls it, *the righteousnels of God, and never the righteousnels of Christ.*

Resp. Mr. *Cl.* himself saith, *it cannot be understood of that righteousnels which is inherent in God, p.* 33. I suppose he means of the Attribute of God's Justice, because its something revealed in the Gospel, and he speaks true in it, but why may not the redeeming righteousnels of Christ be called the righteousnels of God?

1. Because it was the righteousnels of the Person who is God, and *Acts* 20. 28. God is said *to purchase his Church with his own blood*, by a communication of Properties; But 2. Why may not Christ's righteousnels be called the righteousnels of God for the same reason that you say our righteousnels is so called, because it is the way and method through which he hath designed to justifie us, Christ saith, *he is the way*, and if so, then the instituted and ordained way; now if this interpretation of the Text will serve for them, why not for us? I am sure the righteousnels we plead for is the most deserving.

Reason 3. He calls it, *The righteousnels which is of God, not which is in God or Christ.*

Resp. According to Mr. *Cl.* its not the Attribute of Gods righteousnels, but its the work of righteousnels wrought by Go'd in the Person of his Son, therefore its propereft to express it as the Apostle, *of God*, and its often enough said *in Christ*, therefore its not true. I find not any thing said further, by either of them, to support this Notion. Mr. *H.* talks here and there, in divers places about it, but the substance of all is put together more methodically by Mr. *Cl.* and with more modesty.

§. 9. It remains now, that we take the said Texts into distinct Consideration, and examine what righteousnels is by them intended, which is called *the righteousnels of God.*

1. *Rom.* 1. 16, 17. The Subject the Apostle treats of is, the Gospel

Gospel of Christ, the glad tidings brought to Sinners of Life and Salvation in him.

2. This he gives an account of as the reason why he is far from being ashamed of it, in receiving it for its appointed Ends, for his own Salvation, or in preaching it for those ends unto others. 1. Because it is the power of God to Salvation of every one that believes, both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*. 2. In this is the power of God in effectual Grace seen, in that its the Doctrine of Righteousness. 3. He shews its the Doctrine of righteousness by two things. 1. In that this righteousness of God is revealed in it. 2. In that its the object of a Believer's Faith from time to time, its revealed to his first faith, and always of faith justifying afterwards, he lives upon this righteousness from time to time, as he proves from the Prophet, *the just shall live by faith*. Now then its called the righteousness of God. 1. Because its a righteousness provided by God before the foundation of the World in his wise Counsels, and Covenant-Compact with the Son, as the Apostle saith expresly, 1 *Pet.* 1. 19, 20. *Christ as redeemer by his precious bloud, as of a lamb without spot* [this is his righteousness] *who verily* [*i. e.* really as such] *was fore-ordained of God before the foundation of the world*: It was then the Plot and Contrivance of God, and therefore may well be called, *the righteousness of God*. This Purpose and Grace to poor Sinners was first given us in the Person and Righteousness of Christ before the World began, but was manifested since, and especially at the first appearance of Christ in the flesh, actually to work out this righteousness in abolishing Death, and bringing Life and Immortality to Light in the said Gospel of Christ, which he was a Preacher of; this Head I might be large in insisting on, from other places, as *Eph.* 1. 6, 7, 8, 9. *Prov.* 8 30. *Heb.* 10. 8, 9. 2. It is the Righteousness of the Person who is God, *Acts* 20. 28. 3. Its the only righteousness that God is well pleased with a sinner for, and in which he makes his law honourable, *Isa.* 42. 21.

3. God hath called and anointed Christ thereto *in righteousness*, *Isa.* 42. 6. i. e. to answer my law and righteousness therein, and to perform the work of righteousness, the Condition of the Covenant I have given thee for, so *Heb.* 8. 3. *chap.* 5. 5. & 9, 12.

4. Its a Righteousness becoming the Grace of God, as *the gift of righteousness*, Rom. 5. and becoming the Perfect Justice and Law of God, and therefore magnifies his Law, &c. and becoming the Wisdom of God, therefore Christ is called, *the Wisdom of God*; and answers all the ends of God's Glory in Man's Salvation.

5. Its

5. Its the Righteousness of God, in regard of the stateliness and highness thereof, as the Trees of *Lebanon* were called the Trees of *Jehovah*, *Psal.* 104.16.

6. In a way of opposition to all mens inherent righteousness, which is humane, mans righteousness only; this is God's righteousness, and *he hath made Christ to be righteousness to us*, 1 Cor. 1.30.

§. 10. Now here is reason enough why Christ's Righteousness should be called the *righteousness of God*, and that its plainly so intended in the Text appears.

1. Because its a revealed righteousness that Man saw not before, they can easily see their own own righteousness, without Revelation they are addicted.

2. Its the righteousness of Christ that is the righteousness of the Gospel of Christ, the Gospel of Christ is called so, because its the *preaching Christ and him crucified*, 1 *Cor.* 2. and because its his Gospel whereby he cometh and preacheth peace through his righteousness, *Eph.*2.14,15.

3. Its the righteousness of Christ, because its the great object of Faith in Justification; for its absurd to say, our faith is the object of faith, its something without a man first, that he believes upon; faith is the evidence or Hypostacy of things not seen.

4. Its opposed to the Anger and Wrath of God revealed in the Law, *v.* 18. as that righteousness which answers it.

5. The Apostle throughout this Epistle casts off, and abandons all righteousness of ours as insufficient, therefore this must be the righteousness intended.

6. The Text is plain, that the righteousness of God is spoken of objectively, as to faith; for a thing is revealed that it may be seen, its revealed from one act of faith to another, and it is confirmed by the words of the Prophet, *the just shall live by faith*, on this righteousness believing in it, and feeding upon it as their food of life, and therefore is not in themselves, but in the Gospel there as revealed; for the import of the words should be, according to those men, *I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, it is the power of God to Salvation, for therein* [*i. e.* in the Gospel preached, not in our selves] *is the righteousness of God revealed*, from one act of faith to another, to be seen by it [it is not said that faith is revealed to be the righteousness of God, but the righteousness of God in the Gospel,] because it is *the power of God to Salvation*, is revealed to our faith, and to be that righteousness which is Gospel righteousness, therefore not in our selves; 3. The preaching thereof, is the power of God to Salvation, and that which a believers faith lives upon.

§ 11.

§. 11. The next place, *Rom.* 3. 21, 22. The Apostle in the *9th verse* saith, he proved both *Jews* and *Gentiles* under sin, *viz.* under the transgression of the Moral Law, as plainly appears by his Proof unto *v.* 19. now saith he, they are under the law in that they are convict by the law, even the whole World, by ὁ νομος that law, not the Ceremonial but Moral, against which all the forementioned transgressions are committed, and *Gentiles*, who were never under the Ceremonial Law, as well as *Jews*. Now, saith the Apostle, seeing that by this Moral Law the World is condemned, its impossible that any works of obedience to any law whatever should; for if any other law comes to milder terms, unless this law be rescinded, its impossible any man can be righteous before God, hence he concludes, *therefore by the deeds of the law*, i. e. any law, *no flesh can be justified in Gods sight*; whatever Law men may pretend to, God will judge and try all by the Moral Law, for a sinner and transgressor of God's law, can have the knowledge of sin by it, *i. e.* Conviction but nō Salvation by any righteousness of his performance: What then, must all the World perish therefore for want of a righteousness? No, God hath provided a righteousness, [he doth not say, God hath repealed his Law, and made a new one] *the righteousness of God without a new law is evident, or made manifest in the Gospel*, which is witnessed by the Law, *i. e.* of *Moses*, in the Doctrine of Sacrifices, and by the Prophets that have propheſied of Christ, *v.* 22 *even the righteousness of God, which is by the faith of Jesus Christ, viz.* the righteousness of Christ which faith lays hold on, *which is by faith, i. e.* which we receive by faith, for it may be said, what is this righteousness of God? saith the Apostle, *it is in Christ*; how have it we in Christ? by faith: Now, saith he, its unto all, *i. e.* imputed unto all, and upon all, as a covering or robe of righteousness by the faith of every Believer, by the least as well as the greatest, by a *Gentile* Believer as well as a *Jew*; there's no difference in the degree of righteousness, nor in the imputation of it, nor application of it, all Believers are equally, and alike righteous in Christ's righteousness which is the righteousness of God, and the reason added, *for all have sinned, and justified freely by Gods grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ.*

§. 12. Now it appears that the righteousness of God is Christ's righteousness: That righteousness that fully and compleatly satisfied that law which convicted all the world as guilty, is the righteousness of Christ; but such is the righteousness here spoken of, as is apparent by the whole Text. 2. That righteousness which we have by faith in another to justification, is the righte-

righteousness of Christ; but this righteousness is that which we have by and in another; for faith is said to act upon what is without us, and not on that which is within us. 3. That which is imputed to Sinners, devoid of any righteousness by the law, or by any law, is the righteousness of Christ; but this righteousness of God is so, *ergo*, the Propositions of these Syllogisms lies plainly proved in the Text. 4. If all righteousness be here peremptorily rejected, which is performed by us in obedience to any law, then the righteousness here introduced, the righteousness of God, is Christ's righteousness; but the Antecedent is true, *v.* 20. 5. If the righteousness of Christ is our justifying righteousness, which the Apostle intends throughout this Discourse, then God's righteousness is Christ's, but *ergo*, the *Minor*, which is the *Antecedent*, is proved. *The redemption and propitiation of Christ is the righteousness by which we are justified, v.* 24. 6. That righteousness which the law of *Moses* witnesseth to, being the reason and sign thereof, is the righteousness of Christ, as such: For what did the sacrifices for sin, but witness to Christ's great propitiatory sacrifice? but the sacrifices of the law all held forth, *Christ offering himself a sacrifice for sin, and the Gospel was therein preached.* Now it's plain the Apostle brings in the law of *Moses* witnessing to this righteousness of God.

§. 13. The next place is *Rom.* 10. 3. The *Jews* had a zeal for God, and a blind devotion, but were extreme ignorant of Gospel-Mysteries, being *ignorant of the righteousness of God, being ignorant of God' righteousness in the law, viz.* the perfection thereof, *and going about to establish their own imperfect righteousness* unto justification, they submitted not to justification by *God's righteousness, being ignorant of Christ's righteousness*; for it's expressly said to be *the righteousness of God, v.* 4. *Submitted not to the righteousness of God; for Christ is the end of the law, for righteousness to every one that believeth.* Take the Argument then, that *Christ's righteousness is God's*:

1. That righteousness which is directly opposed to our own in justification, is Christ's righteousness; but God's righteousness here is so.

2. *That righteousness which a man being ignorant of, tho' he know his own righteousness, falls short of justification, is Christ's righteousness*; but the righteousness of God in the Text is such; *ergo*,

3. That which is the *end of the law for righteousness*, [*i.e.* answers the law] is the righteousness of God; but *Christ is the end of the law.* This Argument is so plain and full in the Text, that it cannot be answered with any fair pretence, tho' they make a blundering at it to no purpose; and you shall see the Apostle op-

oppoſeth it, *v.* 5. *to the righteouſneſs of the law, conſiſting in doing*; and at once tells us, *the righteouſneſs of God, the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and the righteouſneſs of Faith, is but one righteouſneſs, and oppoſed to the righteouſneſs of the law which the Jews eſtabliſhed*; thinking, as our *Neonomians* do, that it was ſufficient to juſtification to have ſome imperfect ſincere obedience to *Moſes*'s law, (*For I bear them record*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *they have a zeal of God*, that's their ſincerity) which was the new law; for if they were ſaved by the law of Grace, this was diſpenſed to them in *Moſes*'s law; they knew not that God's law required perfect right, and its perfect right muſt anſwer it. Hence it appears that they had the ſame opinion that the *Neonomians* now have, that *Moſes*'s law, was a new law, requiring only obedience to the moral part of it, ſo far as they could, and for their ſins to offer ſacrifice, according to the ceremonial part; and reſting therein, without faith in the Antitype, they reckoned themſelves fully righteous for juſtification: Hence, upon the annual day of atonement, they reckoned themſelves as innocent as *Adam* in his innocency, *i. e.* as free from guilt, propitiation being made, till they had contracted more guilt: Therefore the Apoſtle ſaith, *Heb.* 10. 1. *That the law being a ſhadow of good things to come*, could never with thoſe ſacrifices, which they offered year by year, make the comers thereto perfect; and the moſt carnal of them reckoned themſelves perfected by thoſe ſacrifices but for a time. Therefore it's moſt abſurd, to aſſert, that the carnal *Jews*, whom the Apoſtle writes againſt, did endeavour after a perfection of the law of works; 1. Becauſe they offered ſacrifices, and made atonement for ſin. 2. Becauſe, when they did make atonement, they reckoned they contracted new guilt, and were perfect but for a time: Therefore the Apoſtle ſaith, *Rom.* 9. 30, 31, 32. *they attained not to the righteouſneſs of faith, becauſe they ſought their righteouſneſs as it were by the works of the law*, not directly by perfect obedience, but by ſuch as they had, and not by faith in Chriſt's obedience, for the Apoſtle is expreſs in it, *for they ſtumbled at that ſtumbling ſtone, which was Chriſt*, as the Apoſtle proves, *Behold I lay in Sion a ſtumbling ſtone*, &c. 3. When they offered they confeſſed Sin.

§. 14. Mr. *H.* gives his Explication of this place, *Rom.* 10. 4. thus, *For Chriſt is the end of the Law for righteouſneſs*, i. e. *as I conſtrue it, Chriſt by his ſatisfaction, hath procured that we ſhould not be judged by the law of works, and conſequently, that righteouſneſs or juſtification be attained if we do perform the terms of the Goſpel.*

Reſp. Can Mr. *H.* be ſo irrational, as to think in his Judgment and Conſcience, that this is a genuine Interpretation? Here lies in

in the Text very fairly these two things, 1. That the righteousness of God is explained by him particularly to be the righteousness of Christ—— *have not submitted to, i. e.* accepted the righteousness of God: What is that? the righteousness of Christ, for Christ is the righteousness that answers the righteousness of the law, and this is the righteousness of God. 2. The Design and great End of the Law was righteousness, and perfect righteousness, unto Justification of Man, perfect cannot be performed by fallen man, therefore God hath provided a perfect righteousness in Christ: and *he is this end of the law to every one that believeth*, and herein, by justifying him by this righteousness, *God is just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus*; and its the righteousness of faith, because its not for Justification by any thing that evacuates or relaxeth the law of God, but establisheth it in seeking for, and laying hold upon Justification by a righteousness that fully answers the law. How will it hold in Mr. *H*'s. sence, That Christ by his Satisfaction hath procured, that we should not answer the law of works, or that he should not be the end of the law of works for righteousness to a Believer; but that a believer's performance of obedience to the new law, should be the end of the law of works, for righteousness, which is a direct contradiction to the Text. For he saith, *Christ is the end of the law*, what law? of all law, of works, in way of Satisfaction of the Moral and concurring Ceremonial as an Antitype; he and his righteousness is shadowed forth thereby; he saith not that Christ is the end of a law for a righteousness of our performing, for that would be a contradiction; to say the end of a law is righteousness, and then Christ is the end of it for another righteousness, and not his own; he should have said, believing is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. Lastly, What righteousness is it to take us from under a law, or relax it, or procure that it shall not be satisfied at all, and that the offender shall be justified by another Law?

§. 15. The next Text is, *He hath made him sin for us who knew no sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in him*, 2 Cor. 5. 21. *i. e.* saith Mr. *H.* *the immaculate lamb made a Sacrifice for our sins, that we may become righteous with the righteousness of God, which he accepts through him; Christ as a Sacrifice redeems us from a Law of Sin, and purchaseth for us a law of grace, according to that law we have a righteousness which is a righteousness accepted unto life through Christ.* Medioc. p. 28.

R. So that Mr. *H*'s. meaning must be, That Christ was made Sin under the old law, that we might have righteousness by him under the new law, and that what Christ did under the old law, amounted

amounted to no righteouſneſs to us; But he muſt be righteouſneſs to us under the New Law, and then Chriſt was made under the New Law, which theſe men will deny, and be our righteouſneſs there; no, ſay they, not himſelf be our righteouſneſs, but procure that we ſhould be our own righteouſneſs; then the true meaning is here, That Chriſt was made Sin for us—— that we ſhould be our own righteouſneſs; but how our righteouſneſs in Chriſts? is our righteouſneſs Chriſts? then it is that we may be made Chriſts righteouſneſs, becoming ours by Imputation: Chriſt *being made ſin for us*, he gloſſes upon as the *Socinians, i. e. Chriſt the immaculate Lamb was made a ſacrifice for ſin.* It is true, Chriſt is expreſly ſaid to be a ſacrifice for ſin, but how? 1. As the true Sacrifice, not as a typical, *Heb.* 9. 26. 2. As a Sacrifice to bear Sin; not leſs, but more than all the Sacrifices of Old, and therefore it is ſaid *to be made ſin for us*; he was not a ſinner by nature, neither was his nature corrupted by his being made Sin for us, therefore he was made ſin by legal imputation; *made ſin*, becauſe put under the law, the Prieſts and Sacrifices of old had the ſins of the People laid upon them, ſin was charged on them, their own firſt for which they ſacrificed, then the ſins of the People; but Chriſt did not only bear Sin as the Sacrifice that was ſlain, but as Scape Goat alſo, for one Type could not hold forth the fulneſs of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; therefore the Apoſtle ſaith, he did not only bear ſin, but bore it away, *Heb.* 9. 26, 28. Now its a ſtrange thing that theſe men ſhould ſpit at this Doctrine of Chriſt's bearing Sin, one of late calling it Poyſon; another ſaying, he bore not our very ſins, and all, that he bore only ſuffering for ſin; I would know, how any can ſuffer for Sin. in Law or Juſtice, and not legally bear the charge of ſin? And how Chriſt came to be a Curſe, if he bore not Sin?

2. He bore Sin becauſe he bore the Curſe of the Law, *he was made a curſe*, doth curſe come upon any but for ſin? Is there any in the World but for Sin? therefore whatever ſubject hath the curſe of the law, hath alſo the charge of ſin, for they are inſeparable.

3. How dare any man be ſo audacious as to give the Spirit of God the lie, in that it hath ſo often and peremptorily aſſerted, *We have gone aſtray—— and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all, he hath cauſed them to meet upon him*; will you ſay that is the puniſhment of us all, when the Spirit of God ſpeaks ſo diſtinctly of puniſhment, *v.* 5. and tells us the reaſon, becauſe he bore ſin, *he was wounded for our tranſgreſſion*, becauſe ſin was laid upon him, ſo *v.* 8. *for the tranſgreſſion of my people was he ſtricken*, and leaſt you ſhould be at a ſtand in this Point, about Chriſt's

bearing

bearing ſin, its expreſt again, as the reaſon of Chriſts *juſtifying many, v.* 11. *for he ſhall bear their iniquities.* Nay, its added the third time, *and he bare the ſins of many*; ſo that Chriſts bearing Sin diſtinct from Puniſhment, is no leſs than three times in this *Chapter.* It is alſo fully expreſt in the New-Teſtament, *totidem verbis, Heb.* 9. 28. *Chriſt was once offered* [there's his ſuffering] for what? to bear the ſins of many, and 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. *He his own ſelf bare our ſins in his body on the tree*; and in multitude of places, in expreſſions that are tantamount to theſe; and now to ſay, that Chriſt did not bear ſin, and all things that the Law calls Sin, let it be as filthy and as vile as you will (for its ſo, becauſe its ἀνομία, for all ἁμαρτία is ἀνομία, *and we know he was manifeſt to take away all ſin*; now is there any thing which you call the filth of ſin, is it ἁμαρτία, is it not then ἀνομία, *the tranſgreſſion of the law?* if it be, Chriſt bore it; if he did not, then it ſtands yet in Gods ſight? and the hand-writing of the law is againſt you, and you are not juſtified; and why is Chriſt's Sacrifice ſaid to be the purging of ſin, καθαρισμὸς, many things might be ſaid to ſhew how properly its ſpoken ſee Dr. *Owen.* I muſt for brevity ſake only ſay, that it imports Chriſt's purging us by Sacrifice from all that the law of God calls filthy in ſin: Then its objected, Chriſt was unclean. *Anſw.* Not morally polluted, but legally unclean, while he was under our ſins, as the Sacrifices were, and therefore *he ſuffered without the camp.*

Obj. *Then the Saints have no ſin, who give ſufficient evidence that ſin remains in them.*

Anſw. The Saints are without ſpot before God in Point of Juſtification, they are juſtified from all ſin and filthy ſpot in Gods ſight. 2. Sin remains in them, and will do in Point of Sanctification, which is not perfect in this life, but all in their ſins that is a burden to them, that is odious and filthy, was laid on Chriſt by Imputation, or elſe Chriſt died in vain, or made not full ſatisfaction for their ſins, and they are yet in their ſins, and bear them, and ſo unjuſtified. This I have a little the more enlarged upon for ſome reaſons.

§. 16. *I pray note it, its not ſaid that his righteouſneſs might become ours, nor that we might be made his righteouſneſs, but that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God.*

Reſp. Its ſaid, *that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him*, and what is the righteouſneſs of God in him but his righteouſneſs? *in him*, ſhews where this righteouſneſs of God is, its in him, the Apoſtle ſpeaks not of two Subjects, but of one that is Chriſt; and is it not ſaid, that his righteouſneſs may become ours? what is more plain? 1. Its ſaid, as Chriſt was made

ſin, *viz.* by Imputation, for its a legal making, ſo righteouſneſs is made ours. 2. As our ſins are made Chriſts, not by his Corruption, but being imputed to him juridically; ſo his Righteouſneſs is made ours in Juſtification before God. As he was made Sin in our ſins, ſo we are made Righteouſneſs, in the righteouſneſs of God that is in him: The Phraſe *in him*, determines expreſly what the righteouſneſs of God is, unleſs men will be wilfully blind to plain Truth.

Laſtly, What he ſaith is in uncouth Terms, he ſaith *Chriſt redeemed us from the law of ſin*, I find not the Moral Law any where ſo called, but the law of ſin is the Bent, Propenſity and Inclination of our natures to ſin, and ſo uſed *Rom.* 7.23.

2. He calls meer procurement, Satisfaction, which we have excepted againſt before.

3. Its no ſence to ſay, that Chriſt was made Sin, in making agreement of procuring to obtain any good thing for himſelf or us.

4. Why doth he talk of Chriſts Procurement, when he denys that which is the thing here mentioned, as the next end of Chriſt's being made Sin, which is, *that we ſhould be made the righteouſneſs of God in Chriſt.*

5. If he hath procured that we ſhould not be judged by the law of works, then he hath procured the repeal of the law, then it ceaſeth to be *norma judicii*, and what ſatisfied it.

6. He hath procured a new law, what's that to the righteouſneſs of it, which they deny to be procured by Chriſt? the Parliament procures an Act to pay the King Taxes, but we the People muſt pay the Money.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Other Places of Scripture Vindicated from Falſe Gloſſes.

Section 1. *Mr.* Cl's *Falſe Gloſs on* Iſa. 45. 24. §. 2. *His Gloſs on* Jer. 23. 6. *Examined.* §. 3. *The Branch is Chriſt Prieſt as well as King.* §. 4. 1 Cor. 1. 30. *Examined.* §. 5. Rom. 4. 6. *Examined.* §. 6. Phil. 3. 9. *Examined.* §. 7. Rom. 5. 19. §. 8. *And* Heb. 7. 22. *Examined.* 9. *Further of Chriſt's Suretiſhip.*

Section 1. THE falſe Gloſſes of Mr. *Cl.* are firſt upon *Iſa.* 45. 24. *Surely ſhall one ſay, in the Lord I have righteouſneſs and ſtrength; which,* he ſaith, *are words of the Deity in oppoſition to Idols, and that the moſt rebellious ſhall ſubmit to him, and the ſeed of Iſrael ſhall confeſs they have righteouſneſs by him,* i. e. *of his beſtowing upon them in the ſame manner as they have ſtrength; for as he ſtrengthens us, ſo he makes us righteouſneſs, upon which he deals with us as righteous perſons, and juſtifies us.*

Reſp. The words are the words of Chriſt who is called *Jehovah* in divers places by the Prophets, but that they are the words of *Jehovah* in the Perſon of Chriſt, I am told plainly by the Holy Ghoſt, *Phil.* 2. 10. and Chriſt, *Jehovah* ſwares, *that every knee ſhould bow, and every tongue confeſs,* as the Apoſtle ſaith, *at the Name of Jeſus,* for he ſaith, *he is a juſt God and a Saviour,* ſo is Jeſus, and there is no God or Saviour but he; *there is no other Name given,* therefore this Homage that he calls for is to him as *Jehovah, Saviour,* מושיע אין זולתי, *Acts* 4. 12. 2. Its *him, the ends of the earth, i. e.* the *Gentiles* ſhould look to, to be *ſaved* by. 3. The great thing that hereby we are aſſured of, and promiſed irreverſibly is, that at the time when the *Gentiles* ſhall ſubmit to Chriſt, they ſhall acknowledge that in *Jehovah* the Saviour, Chriſt, they *have righteouſneſs and ſtrength,* its a force to the Text to render ל by (from or by) for its plainly in *Jehovah,* for in Chriſt is our righteouſneſs and ſtrength, and becauſe here is two things named, its no reaſon to ſay they come

to us the ſame way, the fulneſs of Chriſt both of righteouſneſs for Juſtification, by way of imputation, and ſtrength for Sanctification: Now according to theſe Men, to ſay, *in Jehovah I have righteouſneſs*, is to ſay, in my ſelf I have righteouſneſs and ſtrength; but it denotes that the righteouſneſs that we are juſtified by is in *Jehovah*, *v.* 25. and its that which is in *Jehovah*, *for in the Lord ſhall all the ſeed of Iſrael*, i. e. the true ſeed, *be juſtified, and glory*, they ſhall alſo give God the Glory of the ſtrength they receive in Grace; for as Chriſt is *made of God the righteouſneſs*, ſo he is made the Fountain, Head and Root of their Sanctification, and this is a ſpecial Prophecy of the latter days, when the Vail ſhall be removed, aud the Glory of Chriſt ſhine more brightly than to the *Jews* of old, who ſought for righteouſneſs in themſelves for the moſt part, and lived upon a *Neonomian* righteouſneſs, Chriſt Jehovah ſaith it ſhould not be ſo when the ends of the earth came to be his inheritance, then men ſhould renounce their own righteouſneſs, and acknowledge Chriſts righteouſneſs alone to be their juſtifying righteouſneſs, yet that all Grace and Holineſs is treaſured up in him. 1. Its *the righteouſneſs of God*, ſuch *Paul* calls ſo. 2. Its the righteouſneſs of Juſtification. 3. Its a Righteouſneſs of God in Chriſt *Jehovah*. 4. Its a righteouſneſs made ours by Imputation. 5. Its the righteouſneſs that every true Believer is juſtified by, for ſuch are *the Seed of Iſrael* in the days of the Goſpel. 6. It is that righteouſneſs not only to be received to Juſtification, but to be rejoiced in; they ſhall rejoice in Chriſt Jeſus, having no confidence in their own fleſhly righteouſneſs.

§. 2. Mr. *Cl. p.* 31. The next is *Jer.* 23.6. *He ſhall be called the Lord our Righteouſneſs, Much of the ſame import with the former, the words are very general without aſſigning how: Here are four Verſes treating of Chriſt: I obſerve every paſſage refers to his Kingly Office—— v.* 6. *muſt be underſtood in a ſence correſpondent to the reſt. v. That he is the Lord that doth execute Judgment and Righteouſneſs for us; and I deny not but it may refer to a being our Righteouſneſs in ſences agreeable to Scripture, as to be the author of our righteouſneſs.*

Mr. H. *Its not appropriated to the Second Perſon, but to be underſtood of the Goſpel-goodneſs of God, whereby he imputeth righteouſneſs to us, when we have none according to the law of Creation—— ſignifying that God hath found out a means to demonſtrate his Juſtice no leſs fully (and his goodneſs more fully) in ſaving us by this new law through his Sons Mediation, than if we had kept our firſt Innocency, or underwent eternal Judgment.*

Reſp. I find Mr. *H.* talks by roat, I ſuppoſe he did not ſo much

much as turn to Text when he wrote, for he ſpeaks too, ſo abſurdly, as that he manifeſts plain Ignorance of the Text, as to ſay, that its not appropriate to the Son; and indeed all that follows, but I find Mr. *H.* takes his blowing upon a Place of Scripture to be enough to carry away all the Sence and Authority of it. I find Mr. *Cl.* hath lookt much further into the Text, and ſo far contradicts Mr. *H.* as that it is appropriate to Chriſt, but takes it to belong to his Kingly Office what is their ſaid; but is not ſo peremptory as to deny, but it may be underſtood of Chriſt being our Righteouſneſs in other Senſes, we plead but for one Senſe, and that we ſhall endeavour to make good. The Propheſie, as Mr. *Cl.* ſays, belongs to Chriſt who is often entituled צמוח in the Prophets; and the Prophet foretels at leaſt the Days of his Incarnation and Exaltation, the riſing up of his Glory from ſmall unlikely and contemptible Beginnings, *Iſa.* 53. 2, 3. he is called, *Iſa.* 11. 1. a Science חטר, out of the Stemm of *Jeſſe*, and נצר a Branch, or Sprout out of *Davids* Roots, and he is called a Branch eſpecially in that he ſprung out of the then obſcure Houſe of *David* as to his Humane Nature, and ſprang up in a State of Humiliation and Suffering, yet he ſhould ariſe to a glorious Throne, for he ſhould ſit upon the Throne of *David* to Order and Eſtabliſh it, &c. *Iſa.* 9. 9. I deny not, but the Kingly Reign and Government is here ſpoken of, but this is not all that is ſaid of him, when he is entitled the Branch, we have not only his Kingly Qualifications ſpoken of but his Prophetical and Prieſtly, *Iſa.* 11. 1, 2, 3, 4. As its ſaid, he ſhould Judge in Righteouſneſs, ſo its ſaid, Righteouſneſs ſhould be the girdle of his Loins, as the High-Prieſts; and ſo here he ſpeaks not only of his Kingly Juſtice, but of his Prieſtly Righteouſneſs; for he ſaith, as King he ſhall Reign and Proſper, ſo he ſhall Work Judgment and Righteouſneſs in the Earth; עשה משפט וצדקה בארץ, He ſhall Work Judgment and Righteouſneſs, *i. e.* ſhall in the State of his Humiliation Work out Judgment and Righteouſneſs, or while on Earth, and it ſeems to be the genuine meaning in that he had ſpoken of his Kingly Reign before, and immediately ſpeaks of *Judah*'s Salvation and Security therein, and the Reaſon of it ſhould be that he ſhould be called the Lord our Righteouſneſs, becauſe he ſhould be ſo famous not only for Reigning Righteouſneſs, but alſo for Redeeming; and it's in this reſpect the Righteouſneſs of God, and then Gods in *Jehovah* Chriſt, and then ours by giving it to us, and in imputing it to us; for we find that not only the Kingly Righteouſneſs as is aſcribed to the Branch, but alſo a Prieſtly, *Zech.* 6. 13. and what is it that ſhall be done by this Kingly Prieſt? The remo-

val of the Iniquities of the Land in one Day, *Zech.* 3. 9.

§. 3. Hence we ſee this Branch is Jeſus Chriſt, this Branch is ſet forth to be a King and Prieſt, *He ſhall bear the Glory, and Rule, and be a Prieſt upon the Throne*, Zech. 6. 13. And he ſhall be ſuch a Branch as to be the Stone of *Iſrael*, i. e. the Corner Stone as the Lamb, *Rev.* 5. with ſeven Eyes, and ſhould remove and take away the Iniquity of the Land in one Day, *i. e.* by his Righteouſneſs, but you ſay, how comes he to be our Righteouſneſs? God makes him ſo, read the Text right, for יִקָּרֵא is not Paſſive in *Niph*, but Active, therefore its thus, this is the Name which he ſhall call him, *i. e.* The Lord that would raiſe up to *David* a righteous Branch, as King, and Prieſt, a Prieſt of the Tribe of *Judah*, a *Melchizedeck*. This God ſhall put this Name upon him, the Lord our Righteouſneſs; let us go a little further yet, and the Spirit of God will tell us the full intent and meaning of this great Name of Chriſt, ſee *Jer.* 33. 15. And there we ſhall find the very ſame Propheſie repeated with a little Alteration, before God ſaith, *The Day is come, that I will perform the good thing promiſed to the Houſe of Iſrael, and the Houſe of Judah*, what's that, *I will cauſe the Branch of Righteouſneſs* צְמַח צֶדֶק *inde*, by way of Eminency, the Branch that ſhall flouriſh in all Righteouſneſs, Kingly and Prieſtly, *and Iſrael ſhall be ſaved*, &c. He ſhall be Jeſus a Saviour of his People by Righteouſneſs, and this is the Name by which ſhe, *i. e. Iſrael* and *Judah* ſhall be called, the Church, יְקָרְאֶלָה *Jehovah* our Righteouſneſs, *Jehovah-ẓidkenu*; now this Place, I find is a *Noli me tangere* to ſome Divines, let the Men that look upon the Place as ſo dangerous, read the *Hebrew* Text, and they muſt underſtand a great Goſpel Myſtery, that this great Name whereby the Father hath graciouſly as to us, and honourably as to him ſhould be put upon the Church, ſure its to ſhew that the Righteouſneſs of God in Chriſt is put upon the Church; that ſhe is made the Righteouſneſs of *Jehovah* in Chriſt, and you'll ſay, why ſo great and ſacred a Name on the Church, is not this the Name of God only, whoſe Name alone is *Jehovah*? Yes, *Jehovah* is, but *Jehovah-ẓidkenu* is Chriſt's and the Churches, and this is the new Name ſhe is called by, which the Mouth of the Lord hath ſpoken, *Iſa.* 62. 5. but you'll ſay, it ſeems too great for the Church, and it makes Chriſt a Publick Perſon, there's no doubt of the laſt, the Church is called Chriſt, being one Myſtical Body with him, 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. But ſeemeth it too great for the Church to be thus called? Its the new Name which the Mouth of the Lord hath given, and its a Name of a real Thing, God hath made it righteous in Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and why not as well as the Place on Mount

Mori-

Moriah, which *Abraham* called *Jehovah Jireh*, and its ſaid (ſaith *Moſes*) to this Day, in the Mount the Lord will be ſeen, and ſo *Moſes* Builds an Altar, and calls it *Jehovah Niſſi*, the Lords my Banner. Likewiſe *Gideon* calls an Altar *Jehovah Shalom*, *Judg.* 6. 24.

§. 4. Mr. *Cl.* ſaith, *that* 1 Cor. 1. 30. *ſeems to have a great Affinity to this, for he is our Righteouſneſs, and made unto us Righteouſneſs is much alike.*

Reſp. Eſpecially when God makes him our Righteouſneſs, and calls him ſo, for the Words are, *Who of God is made unto us, Wiſdom*, &c. But he ſaith, *Chriſt is not Wiſe and Holy in our ſtead, neither doth it follow then that he is Actively Righteous in our ſtead; but the meaning is, he is the procuring meritorious Cauſe, by his perfect Obedience hath ſatisfied the Law, and procur'd a new Way of Righteouſneſs by Faith, Sanctification.*

Reſp. The Words are not, Chriſt is Wiſe and Holy in our ſtead, but that Chriſt is made of God to us what he is there ſaid to be, whether Wiſdom as a Prophet to teach us, or Righteouſneſs as a Prieſt, to Cloath us with the Garment of Salvation and Robe of Righteouſneſs; and that he is made of God to be what he is in the divers Ways and manner of Being or Conveying, what we have from him, he is our Wiſdom by way of teaching, Righteouſneſs by way of Sacrifice, Sanctification by being the Treaſure of all Grace and Holineſs which God beſtows, he is Redemption, in that all the Promiſes of Inchoation and Conſummation of Redemption are yea and *Amen in him*. But Mr. *Cl.* makes Righteouſneſs and Sanctification all one, and Chriſt being to us all theſe Things one way by meriting and procuring, we have as much right to ſay too, that Chriſt is all theſe one Way, *viz.* by Imputation, becauſe we are ſure he is Righteouſneſs to us by Imputation, but why is Active annexed to Righteouſneſs, he might have excluded his whole Righteouſneſs by what follows, both Active and Paſſive intentionally. But is not Chriſt righteous in our ſtead, when he ſatisfied Gods Law and Juſtice in our ſtead? For what? For any wrong we had done unto the Law of God; I pray, is not that our Righteouſneſs which is Righteouſneſs in our ſtead; but theſe Men will have Satisfaction, and no Satisfaction, only a new Bargain or Purchaſe; likewiſe a Satisfaction, but not for us, ſo their Satisfaction which they will have Chriſt make is no Payment for us nor accounted ſo by God, nor any Satisfaction to him for any wrong we have done him, that which Chriſt hath done is a Purchaſe of a Righteouſneſs; he ſaith, we ſay Righteouſneſs is the Purchaſe Money, accounted to us; ſo that Chriſt is not only a Procurer and Beſtower, but he hath

ſomething to procure and Purchaſe by, he hath ſomething to offer, now as God hath made Chriſt, the ſatisfying Price and Ranſom-mony, ſo he is made of God Righteouſneſs to us; but with Mr. *Cl.* Righteouſneſs and Sanctification is all one, this is hard dealing with *Jehovah* our Righteouſneſs, theſe Men are as the *Jews* of Old, that would not be ſubject to the Righteouſneſs of God.

§. 5. Mr. *Cl.* Another is *Rom.* 4. 6. preſt to ſerve this Cauſe. *As* David *deſcribes the bleſſedneſs of the Man to whom the Lord imputes Righteouſneſs without Works*; ſay they, *the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, but its clear, its not meant of any thing in another Perſon that's imputed for Righteouſneſs, but ſomething in a Mans ſelf, by the whole Tenour of the Chapter, and by* ver. 9. *where he ſaith, Faith was reckoned for Righteouſneſs*; *ſo that the Righteouſneſs imputed here ſpoken of is inherent, graciouſly accounted Righteouſneſs, but in ſtrict Juſtice is not ſo, nor according to the Original Law*, &c.

Reſp. This plain Place which ſtands a Rock againſt all *Popiſh* and *Neonomian* Attempts, he calls preſt into our Service, or Cauſe; no it comes in freely, it's a Volunteer, and mighty thro' God to caſt down all their Confidence and Imaginations, where's the clearneſs in all this Chapter, or *Pſalm* from whence its taken? is it not clear for the Imputation of anothers Righteouſneſs? Is there any thing of ſelf-righteouſneſs? Faith is ſpoken of as accounted to *Abraham* for Righteouſneſs, but we have ſhewn that, that which was imputed to *Abraham* for Righteouſneſs, was the Righteouſneſs of the promiſed Seed; for the Goſpel, which is the Doctrine of Chriſts Righteouſneſs was Preached to him in the Promiſe, and he by Faith ſaw Chriſt's Day of Expiation and Attonement, this he reached by Faith, and it was imputed to him not Faith it ſelf, not the Arm that reached it, but the Righteouſneſs it ſelf. There's a Plain Inſtance in the Goſpel, where what the Object of Faith doth, is aſcrib'd by a Metonymy to Faith it ſelf, *Mat* 9. 21, 22. The diſeaſed Woman touched the Hem of Chriſt's Garment, and was made whole, and Chriſt ſaith, *Woman thy Faith hath made thee whole.* And we ſee *Mark* 9. 29, 30. where is the ſame Narrative, that Chriſt perceived that Vertue was gone out of him, and yet ſaith, *ver.* 34. *Thy Faith hath made thee whole*; now I would know of theſe Men, whether it was Chriſt's Vertue that healed the Woman, or the Vertue of her Faith, Faith as an Act of hers that made her whole? See *Luke* 7. 39, 42, 47, 48, 50. Likewiſe the ſtung *Iſraelites* were healed by looking on the Brazen Serpent, was the healing Vertue in the Brazen Serpent, or in their own Eyes. Let us now examine then how clear it is, that the Place is not meant of the Righteouſneſs

of

of another. The Apostle saith, that David *describeth the righteousness of the man to whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works.*

1. The Apostles design in the whole *Chapter* is to prove our Justification by a righteousness which is not made up of works of our own, and the *Neonomians* say, his design is to prove, Justification by works, are not these *contradicentia?* the Apostle, *negat ubique*, they say, by some works only, the Apostle means works of the old law, they the works of the new; Its strange the Apostle did not except and secure works of the new law; but I suppose, as for the works of the new law he never heard of them, thence his *altum silentium* about the new law and its works too. He saith *David* was justified, or Justification was with a righteousness without works, and yet *David* might plead his own works to Justification, as well as any *Neonomian.*

1. He was no carnal *Jew* that sought Justification by the law of Works, as appears by *Psal.* 51.

2. If there was any Justification then by New-Law works (as indeed there was not then or now) *David* sure must be under the New Law for Justification, and he must needs know the works thereof, whereby he expected to be justified; and therefore I thus argue, *If* David *knew he was justified by works, and blessed therein, then he deals falsly, or the Apostle greatly mistakes him, in saying that* David *proves the blessedness of the man,* &c. the *consequent* is of absolute necessity, and the *assumption* must, *tollere anteced. ut tollat conseq.* for they were both inspired, and therefore could not deceive themselves nor us in this great Point.

Arg. *If* David *proves a righteousness without his own works, either old or new-law works, then it must be works of another that he intends, for there's no righteousness without works of some or another; if he plainly mean the exclusion of his own works, then he must mean some righteousness of another, and not his own, as appears by this* Psal. 31. and also 51. Now we shall prove that *David* means the Righteousness of Christ, and not of the New Law.

1. *That righteousness by which sin is forgiven is not New-Law righteousness, but Christ's, and without our works, but the righteousness is such here.* The *major* is proved from the *Neonomians* themselves, who say, there's no forgiveness in Justification by Works, but forgiveness is consequent of it, for that they go to the old Law Bar, that the righteousness whereby sin is forgiven is the righteousness of Christ, because its expressed by *blood, remission is not without blood*, and forgiveness being one Medium by which the Apostle proves Justification without works.

2. *That righteousness which covers from the eye of God's Justice in*

the

the law, is a righteousness without our works, and anothers, and not of the New Law, but such is the righteousness here spoken of,; such as covers sin from the eye of God's Justice in the Law, such covering *David* meant, as appears *Psal.* 51. 9. *Hide thy face from my sin, and blot out all mine iniquity*; now its such righteousness as will take off the Eye of Divine Justice from our sins, yea cancel and blot out iniquity. Now as to the *major* it appears by the *Neonomian* Doctrine, that their righteousness in Justification doth not cover sin; for they say, its a sinful righteousness, and needs pardon, therefore their righteousness cannot cover sin, which is sinful in it self, and there can be no righteousness but Christ's that can cover sin; Mens own righteousnesses are far from being such covering.

3. *That righteousness through which God imputeth not sin to any chargeable therewith is a righteousness of another, but this righteousness without works is such, Ergo.* The *minor* is plain by the Apostle, for what the Apostle rehearseth from the Prophet, is *David*'s description *of this righteousness without works.* The *major* is clear from what went before, no man hath righteousness enough to cover his own sin. Neither can God not impute sin where he sees sin to be more than righteousness, God must impute Sin where Sin is seen uncovered by righteousness; therefore if there be a righteousness through which God imputeth not sin, its certain its not ours, but Christ's only.

4. That Righteousness through which God imputeth not Sin is justifying Righteousness, and Christs alone, but the Apostle speaks of such a Righteousness. Now the *major* is plain, that Christ's Righteousness is that through which God imputes not sin, for he saith, *Cor.* 5. 9. *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses.*

§. 4. And so likewise, *Phil.* 3. 9. *is of the same import* [they have one answer for all] This Place should have been handled in the former Chapter, but Mr. *Cl.* missing it there, led me out. *Here* Mr. *Cl.* saith, Paul *disclaims only his legal righteousness which he had before Conversion, not his Gospel Righteousness*, viz. *his Repentance, Faith, Love, Humility*, &c. And its the same thing Mr. *H.* saith, *Med.* 31. and tells us, *the* Protestants *are mistaken in their interpretation.* 1. *Because the righteousness of God is not the same with the righteousness of Christ, as hath been observed.*

R. That we have disproved, and proved it a false Assertion, and proved, that the righteousness of God is the righteousness of Christ in all the forementioned places, and is as easily proved here, for the righteousness which he opposeth to his own righteousness, indefinitely, without any exception, is Christs, *that I*

may

may be found in him, in Christ, *not having mine own righteousness*, therefore *in Christ*, is anothers, which righteousness of mine own working is ἐκ νόμου, legal, as all righteousness of our own by which we seek Justification is legal, it cannot in any sence be called Evangelical, therefore *Paul* would be found in Gospel righteousness, which is Christs only, and this is God's righteousness which we receive by believing, ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει.

2. *You are to know that this righteousness which* Paul *calls his own, in this Text, is the righteousness of a Few and Pharisee, not his own as a Christian, this appeareth from the Verses before* v. 4. *and this appears further from* Rom. 10. 1, 2.

R. The righteousness of a *Few* or *Pharisee* was a new-law righteousness, for they were all *Neonomian*. *Paul* could not look upon himself as Perfect, but as to his moral conversation, comparatively blameless; he was sincere, for he had great zeal, and verily thought he did God good Service in persecuting the Church. But Mr. *H.* should have looked to the beginning of the *Chapter*, where he bids them beware of absolutely prophane, of *evil workers*, that carry on mischievous Designs under fair Shews, and lastly, *of the concision*, τὴν κατατομὴν, those that were so fond of their new-law Notions, so as to cast off Christ, or cut themselves off from him, but *we are of the* true *circumcision*, whereby all our fleshly Conceits are cut off, *and worship God in the Spirit, rejoicing in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh*, a fleshly conceit of our own righteousness, in which I had more ground to rejoice than any; and accordingly he tells how exactly he had conformed to *Mose*'s Law, and performed the condition of it as much as any *Pharisee* of them all, and had as much reason to expect Justification by this new imperfect righteousness as any that now do, but Christ had now taught him better things, *what then I counted gain, I now count loss for Christ*, I find I had nothing that advantaged while I was ignorant of Christ, and therefore I find now, that not only my Pharisaical righteousness was loss to me, but any present self-righteousness, even now at this time, ἀλλὰ μενοῦνγε, *I do now esteem all things to be damage, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord*, &c. *and account them dung that I may gain Christ*, and he tells us what he means by that, *that I may be now found in him*, what in respect of holiness, yea especially in respect of righteousness, *not having now my own righteousness, viz.* that of the works of the law, ἐκ νόμου, that which is legal, for so all his righteousness that a man seeks Justification by is ἐκ νόμου, it is of a law, but what is the righteousness he would be found in? τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, that righteousness which I have by the faith of Christ, *the righteousness*

ouſneſs which is of God, for ſuch is that by faith, the righteouſneſs which God giveth, and Chriſt hath, in whom it is, and I do receive by faith; this whole *verſe* treats of his Juſtification and the righteouſneſs thereof, and the following *verſes* treat of the the Sanctification he looks after in Chriſt; and *v.* 9. there its certain that *Paul* oppoſeth the righteouſneſs of Chriſt not only to the righteouſneſs of the law, but to his own righteouſneſs in the largeſt conſideration, any thing of his own now: What he ſaith to *Rom.* 10. 1. is anſwered before. *The Chriſtians Faith, and new Obedience, out of doubt, by God's help, are his righteouſneſs.*

Reſp. Theſe men will hold their Concluſion, let the Scripture ſay what it will. Then the import of the Apoſtle muſt be thus, That I may be found in Chriſt not having mine own righteouſneſs, which is of the old law, but my righteouſneſs of the New Law through faith, the righteouſneſs which is of God by faith.

Paul's *righteouſneſs as a Jew and Phariſee was one thing, and* Paul's *Faith and Obedience, which is his righteouſneſs as a Chriſtian, is another.* To which I anſwer, 1. That *Paul*'s righteouſneſs after Converſion is here directly oppoſed to the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, for he would not be found in his own, but this righteouſneſs of Chriſt, to be found in it, *i. e.* by judicial Enquiry, his own righteouſneſs can't be holineſs, or the having it, for he doth not, nor would ſay, he would not be found having of holineſs.

2. There can be no Goſpel-righteouſneſs of our own that ſtands in competition with the righteouſneſs of Chriſt for Juſtification, for then its legal and fleſhly.

3. A man's own righteouſneſs, whether before or after pretended Converſion, is his own, of the ſame nature and kind, whatever he himſelf may think of it.

4. If it was *Paul*'s Judgment that his works was only chang'd from one law to another, and thought that he was now to be juſtified by his Goſpel-Works, he was as far from the Kingdom of Heaven as before; for one law can no more juſtifie a man by his own works than another, therefore rejects all righteouſneſs of a law.

5. He is very full in expreſſing what righteouſneſs he would be found in, in no righteouſneſs of his own, for all ſuch is legal, in the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, *in him*, this he tells us is the righteouſneſs which faith lays hold on, and this is the righteouſneſs of God, which God imputes to Juſtification, and the ſinner receives by faith.

6. He intends not any thing here of Sanctification in this *v.*

but

but ſpeaks ſingly and by it ſelf, of it in the next; neither doth he call it *his righteouſneſs*, but in this *ver.* ſets aſide all his works, tho he ſhews his value of them in their place, yet as for any place in Juſtification, he counted them but Droſs and Dung. He adds the Words of our Saviour, *except your righteouſneſs exceeds the righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees*, which is againſt him, for no mans righteouſneſs exceeds theirs, which ſtand in his own for Juſtification before God: It muſt not be our own that can, it muſt be Chriſts alone, for no other exceeds theirs.

§. 7. Mr. *Cl.* The next Text is, *by the obedience of one ſhall many be made righteous.* Rom. 5. 19. Here Mr. *Cl.* and Mr. *H.* both exclude Chriſt's active obedience, as having nothing to do. Mr. *H.* ſaith, this is perfect *Antinomian* Faith, and excludes Repentance quite out of this life. I muſt tell him, I am ſorry he underſtands Repentance no better; thoſe that he calls *Antinomian* knows how to reconcile Chriſts Perfections and their Duties together, I ſee, better than he doth, as if Chriſt being a perfect Second *Adam*, did exclude Grace from us, where it is of his fulneſs for righteouſneſs and holineſs that we receive and exerciſe Grace, but ſo much only by the way, as a Mark upon the Dirt that he often throws on the *Proteſtants* and Reformers, and upon the Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf; I muſt confeſs, that I anſwer him with more mildneſs than he deſerves. As to the excluſion of the active obedience of Chriſt, there's no ground for it in the Text, but quite contrary; the deſign of the Apoſtle in the 2d part of the Chapter, from *v.* 12. is to ſhew how Sin and Death entered by the Firſt *Adam*, and how Righteouſneſs and Life entered by the Second *Adam*. He accordingly compares them together as contraries, ſhews that the firſt was a Figure of the other, in his general nature, but after ſhews notwithſtanding their agreement in a general nature, how greatly they differ ſpecifically, ſin entred into the World by the Firſt *Adam*, by imputation of his Sin and by Propagation; ſo Righteouſneſs by Imputation, and Life as the Promiſe annexed unto the Second *Adam*. The Firſt *Adam* was a Type or Figure of the Second.

1. In that the Firſt was a Publick Fœderal and Seminal Head, to all his Poſterity, ſo the Second was to all his; and therefore upon the Fall of Man from the Perfection of the Law, the Second is made under the Law, and ſtands in all the Perfection of it, as a Publick Head to all his ſpiritual Seed: Now that Chriſt's active obedience is not excluded in the Text, appears by the plain *Antitheſis* of the Firſt *Adam*'s diſobedience, to the Second's obedience; for where diſobedience and obedience are ſet one againſt another, then as the one is actual ſin, ſo the other is poſitive

ſitive obedience; for if only paſſive obedience be here meant, then it ſhould be ſaid, as by one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners, ſo by the Sufferings or Satisfactions of one many were made righteous.

2. The Firſt in the Figure was a Publick Perſon, in reſpect of his actual obedience or diſobedience to the Law of God, therefore the Second *Adam* muſt be a Publick Perſon alſo in reſpect of his active obedience, or elſe he anſwers not to the Figure.

3. Chriſt could not be without active obedience as the Head and Root of his Church, the Root muſt be actually holy, or elſe the Branches cannot be ſo.

4. It was eſſential to his High-Prieſthood to be *holy, harmleſs, &c.* as ſuch, and a High Prieſt is a Publick Perſon, and ſtands for the People, I could be very large in proving that Chriſt's active obedience belongs to that righteouſneſs of Chriſt by which we are juſtified; but I ſhall not have room here. Mr. *Cl.* makes as if he would exclude Chriſt's active obedience only from righteouſneſs, but it is the paſſive alſo which both he and Mr. *H.* ſtrikes at, for he ſaith, *As by* Adam's *ſin all his poſterity were brought into a ſtate of ſin, ſo that by the Merits of Chriſt's ſufferings they are brought into ſuch a ſtate as that they may be made righteous.*

Reſp. i. e. They are brought into ſuch a capacity by Chriſt's purchaſing a new law, that they may poſſibly be righteous by their own righteouſneſs; So that *Adam* by his ſin brought his into a ſtate of ſin, but Chriſt by his righteouſneſs doth procure a poſſibility of a righteouſneſs for his; ſo that the Second *Adam* comes ſhort of the Firſt in Conveiance, whereas the Apoſtle hath *much more*, *Rom.*5.17. *If by one mans offence death reigned by one, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, hath abounded unto many*, v. 15. *So if by the offence of one, death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of Grace, and of the gift of righteouſneſs, ſhall reign in life by one Jeſus Chriſt.*

§. 8. Mr. *Cl. Chriſt is called the Surety of a better Covenant* Heb.7.22. *Whence ſome infer, that he hath paid the debt of obedience to God for us; Interpreters generally aſſign two ways wherein Chriſt is a Surety*, 1. *By undertaking for God to us, or his becoming Security for God, that he ſhould make good his Covenant to us on his part.* 2. *By undertaking for us to God, that we ſhould perform the Condition of the Covenant, the firſt the* Polonian *Merchants,* Grotius *and* Hammond *are for; the* Proteſtants *generally ſtick to this latter, that Chriſt is our Surety, by undertaking for us to God; that we ſhall fulfil the Condition of the Covenant by yielding that obedience that is required of us therein.*

Reſp. Mr. *Cl.* tells of the Merchants that they the *Neonomians* do

do trade with, and indeed moſt of their Commodities have *Polonian* ſtamps, not to treat ſo large as to handle all that might be ſaid of the Suretiſhip of Chriſt, it being the very Hinge of our Salvation; though the *Neomonian*, as well as the *Polonian* Merchants make very ſlight of it, and Mr. *H.* in Particular, becauſe he ſaith, its but once uſed in the New Teſtament. I ſay it is therefore a Pearl of great Price, for I could Inſtance in ſeveral ἅπαξ λεγομενα, which the Spirit of God hath uſed in the Old and New; which do expreſs ſingular Truths and Myſteries not common, I ſhall only Note ſome things generally that are Truths I will ſtand by, as 1. That Chriſt is not a Metaphorical Surety, but the moſt proper Surety that ever was, and the Exemplar of all Sureties. 2. That the Word ἐγγυος, ſignifies a Surety for Debt. 3. That is a Surety of the better Covenant, *i. e.* of the Covenant of Grace, not that he was a Surety of the Performance of that Covenant, but that he is the Surety in that Covenant, that is bound to pay the Debt that we owe to the Juſtice of God in the Covenant of Works which we have broken; and he is not ſuch a Surety, as to be bound to the Juſtice of God, that we ſhould pay the Debt [the Lord have Mercy on *Neonomians*] but he hath undertaken to pay the whole Debt for us; every Farthing, if he had been ſuch a Surety as Mr. *Cl.* ſpeaks of; we were in a miſerable Condition. I know the *Neonomians* do moſtly incline to be with their *Polonian* Merchants, in Mr. *Cl.* firſt Point mentioned as to God's Suretiſhip to us, but it's no great Matter where they be, the ſecond Particular being worſe than the former; for Chriſt to be engaged to God, that we ſhall pay the Debt that we owe to the Law of God by *Adams* fall and our Sin; *i. e.* that we ſhall ſatisfie Gods Juſtice for the wrong done, and that we ſhall perform perfect Obedience to the Law; thus much Man muſt pay, tho a poor inſolvent wretched Creature, and Chriſt hath engaged to ſee it done, but not to pay any thing of the Debt himſelf: And indeed I can prove this to be the true Account of their Doctrine; for they ſay, Chriſt hath procured and merited of God a new Law, whereby the old Law is relaxed or repealed (not paid or ſatisfied) a new one is ſet up, the Condition whereof we performing we ſhall be juſtified, but procured not, nor merited the Condition to be performed by us. Now I would fain know, whether Chriſt was a Surety for that which he never Purchaſed, is Chriſt a Surety, that we ſhall perform the Condition of the Covenant, and never merited Faith and Obedience, what a kind of Surety will they have Chriſt, to engage for our Performance, and not take care that we ſhould have the *cum quo*? But Mr. *Cl.* ſeems not to be quite ſatisfied with this ſe-

cond

cond Way. He adds a Third to mend the Matter a little, at leaſt to put a gloſs upon it, *viz.* 3. *To diſcharge that Debt of Suffering, which we did owe the Law for the Tranſgreſſing of it.*

Reſp. Ay Sir, now you ſay ſomething, you bring a Surety with Mony in his Hands, we uſe indeed to ſay, that a Man ſhould never be bound for another, unleſs he reſolve to pay the Debt; Chriſt knew well enough how Poor we ſhould be, when he undertook this Suretiſhip: Well, let us ſee whether Chriſt clears the ſcore for us, or whether he doth leave a conſiderable part of the Debt for us to pay our ſelves: It may be, that which the Law is primarily and moſtly concern'd at, and that for a wiſe *Neonomian* End, *viz.* That if he ſhould pay all, the Sinner would prove an Idle *Antinomian*, and Shabby-fellow, having nothing to do himſelf, and nothing to pay; therefore Chriſt indeed paies ſome of the Debt, but laies up the Sinner in a Work-houſe to pay the reſt at his Fingers ends; For ſaith Mr. *Cl. Now take it in which of theſe Three Ways you will, yet there's nothing of his paying the Debt of Active Obedience.*

Reſp. A very ſad Story indeed, a great noiſe of a Surety, that would pay the whole Debt of the poor Man in Priſon, and when the Matter is ſtrictly enquired into, he hath only prevailed that he ſhould not be whipt ſo often in *Bridewel*, though agreed that he ſhould have the Laſh too pretty ſeverely ſometimes; but as for the greateſt Part of the Debt he muſt Work it out, at leaſt ſo far as a new Law of his which he hath procured and made doth require. Well, when all comes to all, here's nothing done to free the Sinner, but he muſt pay all the good Money by the Sweat of his Brows, for Active Obedience to the Law is indeed that which the Law ſets a High value upon, being the firſt and main Thing that it deſigns and aims at; and it doth expect not only to be ſatisfied for Diſobedience but muſt be obeyed, yea and it muſt be paied by perfect Obedience too not by imperfect: Now ſaith our *Neonomian*, Chriſt was no Surety to pay any of our Debt of Active Obedience; how then, hath he made no Proviſion in this Caſe? Yes truly, he hath done ſomething that may help a little, He hath taken down the old ſtrict Law that kept the Sinner at continual hard-work, and brought in a new eaſie remedying Law, then he makes choice of his own Work, and buſineſs and his own Time, and work at leiſure, only muſt have the Laſh now and then, and beſure that he Work when he is going to Die, and the Condition ſhall be performed and the Debt paid. Now I only briefly argue, if Chriſt was a Surety, it was to pay all our Debt in Active and Paſſive Obedience or none; for Chriſt paid not by halves, though the Paſſive Obedience is hardeſt, yet the

the active is hardest to do, the damned can suffer, and shall, but can pay nothing of the debt by active obedience to the preceptive part of the Law. Well, Christ was a Surety to pay all our Debt by active and passive obedience, for else his righteousness would be imperfect, the law left unsatisfied, and we most certain to perish that could never pay, there is no obedience of the Saints that satisfies the Law, Christ performed that as a Publick Person in their Stead, as well as he bore the passive too, whence the payment of the Debt was full and compleat; but the *Neonomians* will have this part of active obedience left for us to pay, and our active obedience shall be imputed to us for righteousness, though Christ's shall not: So to gather up these mens Suretiship of Christ it is thus, Christ in his transaction with the Father agrees with him, 1. That he would pay one half of the Debt, and we should pay the other and the best half too. 2. That seeing therefore if we should grow insolvent as not to be able to make the payment of our part in currant Money according to the first Law, that he would purchase a new law, and not satisfie the old, but repeal it, and the new law should make all our Brass Money currant, and that God should take that Money for our part, and for his accepting it he becomes Surety for God to us, and thus they come to agree with the *Polonian* Merchants.

§. 9. The Word used *Heb.* 7. 22 is ἔγγυος it signifieth, *præs satisfactionibus obnoxius*, one made liable to make satisfaction for another, and therefore *sponsor & fide-jussor*; *Præs* we are told was an ancient Title of a Surety being one that answer'd the cause of the Commonwealth, to which he was bound, for any it had a complaint against, therefore he was asked by the Magistrate when he appeard, *num præs sit*, he answered *Præs sum*, which imported two things, 1. That he appeared *præs sum quia præ sum*, i. e. *coram, I appear before you.* 2. That he appeared not for himself, but for another, in his place or room, as a publick Person, and Representative of the person or persons for whom he appear'd; what he did he did in the person of him that was represented by him, and so owns himself either *fide-jussor* on his behalf, or *sponsor*, for that the person charged should give satisfaction, or he himself would do it; but when the person represented is apparently insolvent, and never likely to be otherwise, the *Sponsor*'s obligation is not upon conditional terms, if the Principal do not, but he becomes bound absolutely to pay the whole Debt; Christ was thus an absolute Surety for Man insolvent to God in his Law and Justice, to pay the whole Debt due from Man to God; For it was clear to both the Father and the Son, that upon the foreseen Fall Man would be an absolute Bankrupt,

and never able to pay a Farthing of the Debt; hence saith Dr. *Gouge*, *Christ was a Surety to God for Man, of whom the Law required two things*, 1. *Perfect obedience to the Laws Precepts.* 2. *Full satisfaction for sin, both these Christ performed*, *Rom.*5.19. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Gal.* 3. 13. according to whose judgment we hold the Doctrine of the Suretiship of Christ. Then from what hath been said, we may conclude. That the Suretiship of Christ doth eminently belong to his Mediatorial Office, whereby he hath absolutely engaged himself in the Covenant of Grace, to stand and appear for, to answer for us, and satisfie all the Demands of Justice in the Law, according to the full, true and perfect tenor of it, on the behalf of all the Elect, and hath answered, satisfied, and doth appear for them accordingly. I shall speak to this Description particularly, in Brief, 1. This Suretiship eminently belongs to his Mediators Office, because hereby he Mediates to make up the Difference between God and Man; and was called to it by his Father. 2. Because it belongs to his Priestly Office, as the Text shews, in so much that his Father constituted him Surety, by that Oath whereby he made him Priest after the Order of *Melchizedeck*, ver. 20, 21. And by so much, he was a better Surety and Priest than any of Old, in that God never sware that any of them should be Priests for ever after the Order of *Melchizedeck*. 3. It essentially belongs to his Mediators Office in making Reconciliation, as might be amply shewn, if these and other Places be considered, *Heb.* 2. 17. *Eph.* 2. 17. *Col.* 1. 20, 21. *Rom.* 5. 10. 2 *Cor.* 5. 18. 2. In that he is a Surety of the better Testament, because its that better Testament that his Mediators Office, more eminently and fully, according to the Tenor of the Covenant of Grace shines forth in, called the New Testament, *Heb.* 9. 15. The fuller and clearer, and most lasting Revelation of Christ, where he is set as the only High-priest over the House of God, and the Surety thereof, here in better Testament or New Testament, is an expres's Oppositon to the Old Testament Dispensation, which was the Exhibition of the Covenant of Grace more legally and vaild, and under temporal Promises; and therefore the Apostle calls faulty, compare *Heb.* 8. with 2 *Cor.* 3. wherefore Christ is called the High-priest and Surety of this better Testament, the Covenant being therein more perspicuous and manifest; wherein Christ hath his Constitution and Establishment as Surety to his Church. 3. He hath become Surety by Covenant engagement unto God, if thou shalt make thy Soul an Offering for Sin, *&c.* Lord I come to do thy Will, *&c.* all this is by way of Covenant-Agreement, freely engaging on both sides; therefore he is Surety by this Covenant, and not for himself; but

but for Sinners, Debtors to Gods Law, therefore a Publick Person. 4. He is to stand for others to represent them before God, for what Promises are made to him is to them in him; and its *i. e.* what he doth is for them, what he engageth to pay is in their Persons and Room. 5. He promiseth absolutely to pay their Debts, and all the Debts and Demands of that Law both as to Active Obedience and Passive, both as to Obedience and Suffering, the Debt of Obedience to the Preceptive Part of the Law, and the Debt of Punishment as to the vindictive Part of the Law, and in order thereto to write himself Debtor, to bear their Sins, and to be made Sin by Imputation, and this he doth not conditionally, if they don't Pay, but absolutely knowing they could never Pay, nor upon Terms of their performing the Condition of a New Law; but by absolute Obligation to perform the Conditions of this Law which they had offended and broke, and by bearing this Sin and Curse of this Law, and reconciling them to God in respect of this Law, and that not by giving an equivalent but by paying the same, according to the true intent and meaning of the Tenor of the Law. 6. This Engagement he performed as to us in Time, but to God that dwells in Eternity, there's no Time, nor Succession; Christ was set up from Eternity, *Prov.* 8. as Surety, a Thousand Years are to God but as one Day, and much less, therefore Christs Execution of his Suretiship on Earth in the Days of his Flesh was Eternally before the Lord; hence he is said to be slain from the Foundation of the World; hence the faithful before his coming had a full ἄφεσις, or Remission of Sin through this Covenant Relation of Christ, there was not a πάρεσις or passing them by for Remission, till Christ was actually Slain, but they had the Vertue of his Death as fully as we, *Heb.* 4. 15. 7. He continues our Surety that hath paid, standing and pleading his full Satisfaction for us, therefore is our Surety now since Payment, carrying his own Blood into the Holiest of all, and there making Intercession for us.

CHAP. XV.

More Places of Scripture Vindicated from False Glosses.

Section 1. *Of* Daniel 9. 24. §. 2. *Of* Ephes. 1. 4. §. 3. 2 Cor. 5. 19. *examined.* §. 4. *Of* Gal. 5. 7, 8. §. 5. *The Sence of the Apostle* James. §. 6. Mr. H. *and* Mr. Cl. *Answered.*

Section 1. MR. *Hum.* interprets *Daniel* 9. 24. thus, *He shall make reconciliation for iniquity, and so shall bring in an everlasting righteousness,* i. e. *he should by his death procure a Covenant or Law of Grace; by our performance whereof (without the law) we are righteous and must be saved. 'Tis that is our righteousness, if Christ had not procured for us this New Law we could not be saved.*

Resp. Let us see how Mr. *H*'s. Glos's will hold with the Text, for I am sure it holds not with the Analogy of Faith, *Seventy weeks shall be distributed* [נחתך in which word lies the Key of the Prophesie, not to our purpose now to speak to] *upon thy People* [*i. e.* the Church of the *Jews* here] *and upon the City of thy Holiness* [or Holy City] *to finish transgression, to make an end of sin* [these Events seem in our *English* to be the same, but they are not in the Original, the first is most agreeable to the Margent] לכלא *to restrain transgression, i. e.* by the Reformation of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, in the compass of these 72 Weeks, but to make an end להתם make an end of sins or sin-offerings, by the offering up of Christ within the 72 Weeks] *and to make expiation for sin* [true, not typical, and perfect Expiation by the Expiation made by the Blood of Christ] *and to bring everlasting righteousness* [ולביא עדק עולמים to bring in eternal righteousness, or the righteousness of ages Lxx ἀγαγεῖν δικαιοσυνὴν αἰώνιον: We shall go no further in the Prophecy, This Prophecy is generally owned to belong to the first coming of Christ, and in this Verse the time is set in a mysterious manner to the coming of Christ, his offering up and erecting the Gospel Church, the Angels the Events that should fall out in this compass of time, especially toward the latter end, in the Sacrifice of Christ, wherein he should make

make an end of sin εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας the abolishing Sin by the sacrifice of himself, *Heb.* 9.26. wherein he also finished all sin-offerings. 2. He should put it away by making atonement and Expiation, Lxx. καὶ ἀπαλειψαῖ τὰς ἀδικιας καὶ τοῦ ἐξιλάσασθαι ἀδικίαι, to blot out, and attone for transgression. כפו in *pih.* signifieth to make Expiation and Atonement by Sacrifice, even to the blotting them out, and full satisfaction to Divine Justice, for then sin is expiated when the Debt-Book is cancell'd; thus the bloud of the Sacrifice was sprinkled on the Book of the Law, and on all the People, so that there is plenary satisfaction in the bloud of Christ, and thereby a righteousness everlasting brought in, *i. e.* preached, called εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον, *Rev.* 14. 6. 2. Thereby revealed and made manifest, freed from the Vails and Shadows of the Old Testament, for tho it was given us in Christ before the World began, and lay obscured long under the Old Testament Types, yet now was made manifest by the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath abolished Death [καταργήσαντος, nulling or abandoning death] and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel, the Apostle seeming plainly to allude to these expressions of *Daniel*, *the bringing in of righteousness*, is plainly no more than the bringing the sacrifice and satisfaction of Christ for everlasting righteousness, opposed to the righteousness of the legal Sacrifices, which was but temporary, offered every year, but this Expiation of Christ was one offering, and the righteousness of Ages; or if it carry any thing distinct from preceding Events, that it be not to be understood of the passive obedience of Christ, the Spirit of God expresseth to all the fulness thereof; he adds this to signifie the active obedience of Christ, which is also everlasting, and to be understood always as a complement of that perfect righteousness of Christ.

In Answer to Mr. *H.* I say, 1. Christ himself is the everlasting righteousness, its not procured, but its that which procures. 2. The Righteousness of Christ is here prophesied of, not the righteousness of our selves. 3. Its the Righteousness that expiates the old transgressions, and therefore here is nothing of a New-Law spoken of. 4. Justifying righteousness is such as satisfies the Law broken, and therefore there must be at least Expiation in it. 5. Its very absurd, and *contradictio in adjecto*, to talk of a Law of Grace, if thereby be meant a law for Justification; and again absurder, to talk of performing the condition of a law without law. 6. How is new-law-righteousness, for its but imperfect obedience, and therefore will be quite wipt away at death; for when things that are perfect are come, those that

are imperfect are done away; you will ſay, it may laſt in a perfect righteouſneſs, than the New Law will turn into the old; for they make imperfection to be a proper adjunct of the works of the New-Law, and appropriate to it to diſtinguiſh it from the old law. So that here they are juſtified by the New Law, and in Heaven by the Old Law: What a ſtir do theſe men make with the Law? and how do they ſhift and ſhirk from one law to another, ſwerving from Faith and Truth, to laws ſingly, making themſelves great teachers of the laws, but underſtanding neither what they ſay, nor whereof they affirm, I would fain know whether *Daniel* was juſtified by his own New Law righteouſneſs? it ſeems he did not underſtand that that kind of Juſtification was then a-foot, and its a Wonder the Angel *Gabriel* could come to tell him, that in a few years hence the Meſſias ſhould come and bring in old ſelf-righteouſneſs again for Juſtification, which is ſo choice and precious a Commodity, that it ſhall coſt him his blood to purchaſe, Would not *Daniel* be amazed at it, that a man ſo beloved as he was, was ignorant of it, but that very day, as *v.16. According to thy righteouſneſs, I beſeech thee, let thy anger and thy fury be turned away*; a *Neonomian* will Gloſs thus, *i. e.* according to our righteouſneſs of the New Law, *v.* 18. *We do not preſent our ſupplications to thee for our righteouſneſs* [*i. e.* ſay the *Neonomians*, the righteouſneſs of the Old Law, not of the New] *but for thy great mercy*, that, ſay they, is the Law of Grace, ſo they will have their Belly-full of law ſhortly.

§. 2. Mr. *H.* gives a wild Gloſs upon *Eph.* 1. 4. *According as he hath choſen us in Chriſt. before the Foundation of the World; he ſaith, the Election of Grace is the Election of Grace, and Gods chooſing us, is the taking the Way and Method of Grace, and not of Works, a choice way of ſaving.*

Reſp. Ay indeed its a choice way to ſave by Grace, and not by Works, but to ſave by Grace and yet by Works is a Contradiction in *Paul*'s Logick. *Election is in Chriſt, how according to common Notion of Election is over hard to conceive, but take it in this Notion, and here is even Day-light, if you take it for the Law of Grace, the Law is the Will of the Law-giver, and that's all one with the Goſpel, there's no difficulty in it.*

Reſp. This Man is ſo fond of his New Law, that ask him of what Place of Scripture you will, what it means, and he will tell you its the New Law, what is Election? The New Law, what is Redemption? Purchaſe of the New Law? How are you juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of the New Law; how ſhall you be judged by the New Law? what's the Goſpel? the New Law; may not theſe Men be fitly call'd *Neonomian*, that thus New Law it, *its hard*

hard to conceive how Election is in Chriſt, why? Becauſe he can not conceive Chriſt to be a common Perſon or Head of the Elect, and that Chriſt as ſuch was choſen, and the whole Body in him; but tell him, that we are choſen in the New Law, and the Difficulty is removed; and you ſee what he makes of the Goſpel, it is the Law-giver, I think its Time to give over talking with Men whoſe Wits go a Wool-gathering, once more though

§. 3. 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *God was in Chriſt reconciling the World to himſelf, not imputing their Treſpaſſes, and hath committed to us the Word of Reconciliation; the Word is, the Goſpel declaring to the World this purchaſed Pardon, the Pardon is General, a ſtanding Pardon, an Act of Grace; yet if any will have Benefit by it, he muſt look into the Act, and ſee how he is to be qualified.*

Reſp. The Goſpel, he ſaith, is the Declaration of the New Law, the making of which was an Act of general Pardon, for all the World; and for this Pardon Chriſt atoned, none could obtain this but Chriſt; and here all the Rogues and Whores in the World continuing ſo, are pardoned at once; now the ſilly *Antinomian* talks only of the Pardon of Believers before Faith, now a *Neonomian* doth *Antinomize* to Purpoſe and Mr. *H.* is willing Chriſt ſhall have the Honour of ſaving *Peter*, ſo far as he ſaved *Judas*, and ſo far it's from the Love of the Father in ſending his Son to fulfil the Law, how? By no Obedience to it, or Satisfaction for wrong done to him in it, and in this Sence he will allow Grace is without Condition; *i. e.* as much as Creation is Grace, and God's giving a Law at firſt; it's true, whatever Act God puts forth at firſt to a Created Being, in a way of Nature, or Juriſdiction, or Mercy; it may be ſaid to proceed from his Sovereignty, but it cannot ſhine forth in a way of Grace, unleſs it be the beſtowing ſome good Thing in a way of Speciality, Peculiarity, and in Diſtinction from others; not to do ſomething in general, for all the World in common, this is not that which will bear the Name of Grace; likewiſe, conſidering that what he calls a Law of Grace is but an Exhibition of a Law of Works; for it is but, do believe; God had made the firſt Law as much a Law of Grace, as this, had the World been as full of People as ſince, and more, for it had been eaſier to perfect Man to perform than now, an un-performable condition is to lapſed man. This is Grace without conditions (he ſaith) even as much as the firſt Covenant; for God made that Covenant without Man's cauſing it, the Condition was *lege conſtituta*, in the law enacted, the previous cauſes of a law, whether it proceed from the meer pleaſure of the Legiſlator, or obtained from him by Petition or Purchace, are not conſidered in the law by the Subject, its the tenour of it that

he looks at, and is concerned in it, therefore the making a law, the proper nature whereof is to be conditional, and promulgatting of it to all the world, is no Pardon; therefore he ſoon trips up the heels of his General Pardon, in ſaying, *If any come to look for benefit by this Pardon, Act of Grace, Law, Covenant, Teſtament,* (any thing, *a declaration of the will of God,* as he ſaith, which being a law is not therefore Grace) he *muſt read it, and ſee the conditions or terms that God requires.* And are not theſe conditions required of all the World? are they therefore pardoned becauſe they are required of them? *its required of every man* (he ſaith) *to believe, repent, walk ſincerely in order to the benefit,* if theſe be the conditions of the Covenant, then not free, becauſe working conditions are required of all the World, which by the World are unperformable. The main of the Text he cannot ſee, he is ſo dazled with his New Law, *v.* 18. *All things are of God* [even the reconciliation of the World, as well as its new Creation, and therefore the righteouſneſs by which reconciliation is made, is *of God,* and therefore ſaith] *reconciling us* [by Expiation and Satisfaction, for ſo the word τῷ καταλλάξαντι, ſignifying reconciling by an Expiatory Sacrifice] *to himſelf* [the enmity was between the Sinner and God, and God in this Grace is the firſt mover of Reconciliation] *by or in Jeſus Chriſt* [in whom the righteouſneſs of Satisfaction is] *giving to us the word of reconciliation* [*i. e.* the Goſpel in which this reconciliation is preached, whereby the Sinner ſeeing the preventing love of God in the myſtery of Reconciliation, by the Impetration of Chriſt, he may have the application of this Grace alſo by Faith, for this is the great doctrin that reconciles the heart and brings him to believe. This he repeats *v.* 9. ſhewing only exegetically, that we who are to be ſaved are the world in the ſenſe of the Scripture in this truth, by an uſual ſynecdoche of the choice part being put for the whole, and the whole for the better part not imputing their Treſpaſſes] ſhew which is the great thing done in reconciliation of a Sinner to God, its non-Imputation of ſin, which contains Imputation of righteouſneſs, for wherever ſin is not Imputed to condemnation, righteouſneſs is Imputed to Juſtification ſo here its manifeſt that its not our own righteouſneſs that is Imputed to Juſtification, but his only by which reconciliation is made, and ſin not imputed, whence it follows alſo that our ſins were Imputed to Chriſt, or elſe there could not be the non-Imputation of them unto us.

§. 4. Mr. *Cl.* makes a long Diſcourſe to acquaint us, that *Paul* and *James* do both mean Juſtification by Faith to be Juſtification by Works; that *Paul* in denial of Juſtification by works only, means works of the law; then, I ſay, he excludes all works, for

for all works performed for Juſtification are works of the law, and to ſay that ſuch are Goſpel-works, is to ſay, the Sea burns. And that *James* ſpeaks of *Abraham*'s Juſtification before God by Faith in conjunction with Works; That *Paul* makes a perfect excluſion of all works of any law from Juſtification, *i e.* works of our own performance hath been ſufficiently made to appear; what he alledgeth for *Paul*'s meaning, *p.* 70. may be a little ſpoken to, *and undertakes* to tell us, from *Gal.* 5. 5, 6. compared with *chap.* 6. 15. that *Paul* intends *works as well as faith when he rejects works from Juſtification:* I muſt ſay as I have ſaid, If *Paul* was of their mind, it is ſtrange that in Two Epiſtles he had not acquainted us what he meant, when he ſhall only intend *Jewiſh* Services which the *Gentiles* are not concerned in, and perfect works of the Moral Law, which none ever performed, ſince the Fall, but Chriſt alone, that he ſhould mean Goſpel-works, and not tell us, what were the Goſpel-works which he meant, when Goſpel-works whereby any man ſeeks Juſtification, are law-works, and therefore *contradictio in adjecto.* The Apoſtle to the *Galatians*, *v.* 4. makes a ſolemn Proteſtation, that *whoever is* [*i. e.* profeſſeth to be] *juſtified by law* [by his own works of a law] hath abdicated Chriſt, *and fallen from Grace*, where there cannot be a law of Grace; for to aſſert a law in our Juſtification by our performance of the works of it, is to fall from Grace; now it is ſtrange that he did not ſpecifie the Law and Works that he intended we are juſtified by. Mr. *Cl.* ſaith he did, in his ſpecifying Love and the New Creature. *Verſe 6. in Chriſt Jeſus neither circumciſion availeth any thing, nor uncircumciſion, but faith that worketh by love*; the Apoſtle had ſaid before, as for us our expectation of righteouſneſs is only by faith, for its nothing that availeth at all in Chriſt but a true faith, and that is true which worketh by love, which bringeth forth goodfruits, and one of the more eminent is inſtanced in, which is love; now he doth here ſet by all the other Graces and Duties, in compariſon of faith, becauſe it hath a peculiar nature of receiving a juſtifying righteouſneſs from without, and in denying and rejecting it ſelf, or any doing by us for that end; hence he ſaith, its not any works of the circumciſion, that is of thoſe that profeſs Juſtification by Works in the *Jewiſh* Religion, nor of the works of the uncircumciſion, *i.e.* works of the Chriſtian Religion, that ſignifies any thing, but true Faith only; this is the plain meaning of the Apoſtle. As for *Chap.* 6. 15. it ſignifies nothing as to our adverſaries. *v.* 14. He ſhewed how his glorying was always in the Croſs of Chriſt, both unto Juſtification and Sanctification; for *to be in Chriſt*, implies both, and he deſires and looks for no other ground of rejoicing than

than the Croſs of Chriſt; neither is there any other ground to any one, *Jew* or *Gentile*; there is nothing in either that is to be valued but the *new Creature*, which is the life of Juſtification and Sanctification, both which is by being in Chriſt Jeſus, he being to every Believer whatever he is for Righteouſneſs and Life; ſo that here is nothing to exalt the new creature to righteouſneſs for Juſtification, but to exalt Chriſt Jeſus to be all and in all to the new creature for righteouſneſs in Juſtification; and as the Head and Root of Holineſs in Sanctification.

§. 5. And now it will appear what the ſence of *James* is, The main Scope of the Apoſtle in *chap.* 2. is, to exhort to the impartial exerciſe of Charity to the Saints, and after many Arguments, *v.* 14. he tells us, not to exerciſe Love and Charity is a ſign of a falſe Faith, *ſuch as will not ſave us*, as plainly appears by, *v.* 15. 16, 17. Even as the Apoſtle *Paul* ſaith, *true faith is that which worketh by love*; ſo he ſaith, that which doth not work by love in the exerciſe of true and faithful charity *is dead faith, being alone, i. e.* having no fruits but an outward Name and Profeſſion only; and further, *v.* 18. *How*, ſaith he, *wilt thou demonſtrate to another perſon that thou haſt faith, thou ſaiſt to another, I have faith, but ſaith that other, demonſtrate it to me by thy works, that it may appear to me by thy works, I will ſhew thee my works, whereby thou ſhalt conclude I have queſtion, and juſtifie me and my profeſſion before all men that have a queſtion or doubt thereof:* Thou believeſt it may be, by an hiſtorical or dogmatical faith, as to ſome things, ſo do the Devils: *But* (v. 20.) *wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead, i. e.* wilt thou have demonſtration of it, how dead? It is not juſtifying faith, and therefore not ſaving, for all true, ſaving faith is juſtified againſt all objections men can make againſt it. 1. He inſtances in *Abraham*, the obedience of *Abraham* to God was a ground of mens juſtification of *Abraham* as a true Believer, provided his action was good obedience which ſeemed ſo unnatural, wherefore God himſelf witneſſeth to his obedience, as good, and an eminent effect of true Faith, therefore he was juſtified by works, not as to his ſtate before God, for he was in a juſtified ſtate before, but firſt, provided his obedience were good, all men muſt juſtifie *Abraham* to be an eminent Believer. Again, God bore witneſs to *Abraham*'s obedience as good, therefore *Abraham* was juſtified to be a true Believer from his works. So that *Abraham* was juſtified as to his faith, as true, good and eminent, by his, or from his obedience; therefore the Apoſtle ſaith, thou ſeeſt how his faith co-works with his works, *i. e.* he did theſe actions in faith, and faith carrying

rying him on to ſuch works, his faith was perfected thereby, *i. e.* as a Tree that hath its fruits growing upon it, all true faith thriving and flouriſhing in that manner. He inſiſts upon *Abraham*'s again, and tells us, That the Scripture was fulfilled, [or is proved to be true] in two great things. 1. That it ſaith, *he was juſtified by faith*, i. e. *he believed God, and it was counted to him for righteouſneſs*; what was imputed, his faith? No, it was the bleſſing in the Promiſe, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt and his righteouſneſs, that he believed. 2. The Scripture ſaith, *his faith worked by love*, therefore it was not a dead faith; he was called *the friend of God*, he was from the greatneſs of love he had to God, ready to yield any obedience to God, thence the Apoſtle denies not, that he was juſtified by faith only, as to his Perſon, but that God declared and witneſſed alſo to his obedience, as approved of by him, which in the ſence the Apoſtle is ſpeaking of, was a Juſtification as to his Faith, and the goodneſs of it in his particular acts of obedience, *v.* 24. *you ſee therefore that a man is juſtified by works*, [a man may have an approbation of his works, and a commendation from God for them] *and not of his faith only* [God may commend and approve of a mans works as well as his faith, for indeed it is a Juſtification by *way of commendation and approbation* of a mans faith and works which the Apoſtle *James* here ſpeaks of.] Likewiſe *v.* 25. *Rahab the harlot was ſhe not juſtified by works* [*i. e.* did ſhe not approve her ſelf to be a true Believer?] *when ſhe received the meſſengers, and had ſent them out another way.* The World would be apt to condemn this action of *Rahab*, as treachery to her Native Country, and therefore God juſtifies her in this particular action, that it was good, being done in faith, God witneſſeth to it in his Word, and juſtifies her as a Believer, *in foro mundi*, by this eminent act of her, *v.* 26. whence having given theſe inſtances, he concludes, *as a body without a ſpirit is dead, ſo is faith without works dead*; and that was the thing which he undertook to prove, that faith, *i. e. ſuppoſed* or *profeſſed*, is dead, if it be fruitleſs; hence, he ſaith, Believers have been juſtified to be ſo by God, in giving Teſtimony to their works, as true fruits of ſaving faith. Wherefore we may conclude, that *James* and *Paul* are agreed in all. 1. That *James* ſpeaks of faith in general, a Profeſſion of Chriſtian Faith, and that ſuch Profeſſion is empty and profitable to our ſelves and others, as alſo dead in it ſelf, if it is not juſtified by good works; ſo the Apoſtle *Paul* often ſpeaks of ſaving faith, and our Saviour Chriſt, that we can have no better Argument of each others truth of faith than the fruit growing upon the tree, this is without queſtion to *v.* 19. 2. He proves it in that they were true Believers, had a double

a double Juſtification. 1. By Faith only, and here he concurs with *Paul* concerning his Juſtification before God, *v.* 23. and yet he had ſuch a faith as wrought by love, for the Scripture calls him *the friend of God*. 2. That there is a Juſtification of a Perſon as to a particular act, as well as his Perſon and State, and therefore the inſtance of *Abraham*'s offering his Son, and *Rahab* is brought in, and this is that Juſtification which the Apoſtle *Paul* ſpeaks not ſo much of, but the Spirit of God doth in ſeveral caſes, as *Abel* and *Enoch*, God teſtifying ſome way to their Services *in foro mundi*, and ſo *Job*, whom God juſtified againſt the unjuſt charges of his Friends; ſo *Phineas* his zeal for the glory of God in the matter of *Cosbi*, that ſeemed a raſh and mutinous piece of Uſurpation. God juſtified him in it, declared his high approbation thereof. Hence *James* ſpeaks of *faith that accompanies ſalvation*, at large, and condemns that as falſe and hypocritical, that is not fruitful. 2. He ſpeaks of Juſtification at large, which is by faith *in foro divino*, before God, and *in foro humano*, before Men; by works and fruits of faith, that *in foro divino*, is by faith only without works. 1. In that he ſaith, no works of ours can anſwer God's law, *v.* 10. *He that keeps*, or pretends to keep, *the whole law, and offends in one point, is guilty of all*; whence ariſeth this unanſwerable Argument, *They that cannot keep the whole law of God without offending in one point, can never be juſtified before God by works, but none can do ſo*, Ergo. 2. He aſſerts Juſtification by faith before God in the inſtance of *Abraham*'s faith, uſing the ſame Expreſſion, and doth not deny this to be true Juſtification, and full before God, but only *Abraham* brought forth the fruits before Men, from his faith working by love he is called *the friend of God*; thus God juſtified him in his obedience as a true Believer, *Ergo*, he concludes, as all true faith, ſo true juſtifying faith hath ſuch fruit. 3. *James* ſhews how God often bears witneſs and approves of particular actions which men are ready to condemn, ſuch as *Abraham*'s offering up his Son, and *Rahab*'s giving up the City, and ſuch a Teſtimony that they performed it by faith in Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs; for no other are approved of by God as Goſpel-Works, and thus you have the full ſcope of *James*, not contradicting the Apoſtle *Paul* at all, but ſpeaking only of another Juſtification *in foro humano*, in the effects that Men ſee, and the approbation that God gives.

§. 6. Hence I anſwer Mr. *Cl.* who ſaith, the ſame Juſtification is intended by *Paul* and *James*. I ſay, *James* intends the ſame Juſtification before God, *in foro Dei, aut Legis*, when he ſpeaks of Juſtification by Faith, but he intends not the ſame when he ſpeaks of Juſtification by works; he intends, as *Paul* doth, ſo far

far as he ſpeaks of Juſtification by Faith, but when he ſpeaks of the ſame perſons juſtification by works, it intends only Gods declaration of his approbation of the particular Acts of obedience and bearing witneſs thereto, of the true faith in *foro humano* by word or evidences, as in that whole of *Hebr.* 11. And in divers other Scripture *James* ſpeaks of *Juſtification of a mans perſon*; It is true and here its aſcribed to his faith, the righteouſneſs he receives by faith is imputed to him, but the faith is not all the approbation that he hath, not all his Juſtification he is alſo juſtified *coram hominibus.* He doth not ſay works were imputed to him for righteouſneſs? But he and his works for his perſon, then his obedience being accepted by God in Chriſt, God witneſſeth before men to his faith and obedience, and to his faith by owning his obedience. So that he ſpeaks both of the Juſtification of his perſon and of his faith too but in divers reſpects.

2. *Can his faith ſave him, Implying, that tho faith without works cannot ſave, yet faith with works will; for Saved, and Juſtified, both belong to the ſame Subject.*

R. True, but that doth not prove that Juſtifying and Saving is in all reſpects the ſame, for there may be works as well as faith in that reſpect ſaving, becauſe both accompany Salvation, but its not therefore that Saving in all reſpects is Juſtifying, for there's ſaving in ſanctification and glorification; and tho faith without it be ſuch as in time produceth works will not ſave upon any account, yet it follows not that works do juſtify before God.

3. *He ſpeaks of the perſon of* Abraham *being Juſtified, and there was a concurrence of his works with his faith in his Juſtification.*

R. There was in *foro humano*, for he could not appear unto men that he had faith but by works, if *Abraham* ſaith he is a believer and righteous before God, another man will ſay ſhew me ſuch works as will argue it to me? So *Abraham* ſhews his obedience, and his faith concurrs to it for he could do ſuch works but by Faith, and God witneſſeth to them *Heb.* 11. *coram hominibus.*

4. *He rejects being Juſtifyed by Faith only.*

R. 1. He cannot be Juſtifyed by Faith that is dead and barren. 2*ly*, He cannot be Juſtifyed before God and man too without works. 3*ly*, There was not any held a mans Faith was juſtifyed by his faith but his perſon, and that his faith was juſtifyed to men by his outward demeanour in exerciſing viſible graces.

5. *The reaſon that he coucheth in that Similitude*, v. 26. *ſhews, that he ſpeaks of the Juſtification of the perſon.* viz. *That ſuch a faith cannot Juſtify becauſe its dead.*

R. The

R. The words are, *as the body without the ſpirit is dead, ſo faith without works is dead.* Theſe words ſhew only what was the drift of the Apoſtles diſcourſe from the 14 *v.viz.* to ſhew that faith which bringeth not forth good works is not true, it will not ſave, it will not profit, it is no better than reprobates may have, it is not Juſtifying before God or Man. Now then for Mr. *Cl.* Pairs of Antith. he ſaith, *A man is juſtifyed by works, as* James *ſaith, a man is Juſtifyed without works of the law,* i. e. *ſaith he, A man is Juſtifyed by ſuch works as are in the nature of living faith, but not by ſuch as are works of the law.*

R. All works and faith it ſelf as a qualification are works of a Law, and whereby no fleſh living ſhall be juſtify'd, *Gal.* 3. 11. and tho the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, and owns *Abraham*'s Juſtification by faith before God as *Paul* doth *Rom.* 4. yet he no where ſaith a perſon is juſtifyed by works before God, if he had ſaid ſo he had directly contradicted the Apoſtle *Paul*, but the Reconciliation is thus, a believer is not Juſtified by works before God, but he is juſtifyed by works of faith or fruits of it before man. *2d. Pair, A man is Juſtifyed by faith, and a man is not Juſtifyed by Faith only.* Reconc. A man is Juſtifyed by that faith that includes works, but not by that faith that is without works. Recon. A man is Juſtifyed by faith objectively which produceth works before God, and man is not Juſtifyed without works before man. *The 3d, Pair is thus, A man is Juſtifyed by Faith and a man is Juſtifyed by Works, I reconcile thus, a man is juſtifyed by that faith which brings forth works, and a man is juſtifyed by thoſe works.*

R. Recon. a man is juſtifyed before God by faith, a man is juſtifyed before man by works. By all which it appears that *Paul* and *James* are agreed in the nature of true Faith and Juſtification by it in the ſight of God; but only *James* ſpeaks of Juſtification in a larger ſence, to wit, Juſtification in *foro humano*, as well as *Divino*, and therefore he aſcribes a kind of Juſtification to works, ſo that a man cannot be Juſtifyed by Faith alone, in the largeſt ſence, ſeeing he cannot be Juſtifyed before man without works. Now if he had meant as our *Neonom.* do, he muſt have aſcribed all Juſtification to works only, for they hold our Juſtification by Faith to be no otherwiſe than as a work. Mr. *Cl. ſeems to boaſt himſelf in expreſſion of the* Pſal. 106. 3. 1. *concerning* Phineas, *where* חנכ *is uſed the ſame root, which is uſed of* Abraham's *Faith,* Gen. 15. 6. Where the thing that *Abraham* believed in the Promiſe, God Imputed to him for righteouſneſs as the Apoſtle expounds *Gal.* 3. 6. 8. for he ſaw Chriſt in that Goſpel preached to him as our Saviour witneſſeth, and as the word there is an Active ſignification. It is a Paſſive in *Niph.* with

the

the *Psalm.* it plainly referrs to the particular Act of *Phineas.* It is said, that *Phineas* stood up and executed Judgment and the Plague was stayed, and it was reckoned to וחשב לעקה for Righteousness, for a noble righteous just Act, to all Generations, its not said that the Lord accounted it him for the righteousness of his person before God, but God bore witness to the seasonableness and justice of the action in staying of the Plague, and such an effect being thereof, all men have since judged it a righteous just Act to all Generations. So that the word is not used impersonally but personally and passively, and the Act which he perform'd is the Nominative Case, neither is λογισθη used impersonally but the thing that God promises and he believes is the Nominative Case.

CHAP. XVI.

The Righteousness of Christ is the only Righteousness whereby a sinner is Justified in God's sight.

Section 1. *The Transition, and Subject asserted.* §. 2. *Argument* 1. §. 3. *Arg.* 2. §. 4. *Arg.* 3. §. 5. *Arg.* 4. §. 6. *Arg.* 5. §. 7. *Arg.* 6. §. 8. *Arg.* 7. §. 9. *Arg.* 8. §. 10. *Arg.* 9. §. 11. *Arg.* 10. §. 12. *Arg.* 11. § 13. *Arg.* 12. §. 14. *Arg.* 13. §. 15. *Arg.* 14. §. 16. *Arg.* 15.

Sect. 1. HAving written hitherto in way of defence, against the Adversaries of our Justification by Christ's Righteousness, and having in some measure (as I trust) the mind of the Spirit, I dare not let these Adversaries pass without using the Sword of the Spirit, to the wounding their Doctrine even in its very Vitals, by home thrusts and downright blows. For the Lord *Jesus* Christ who is come forth upon his white Horse, with a Bow and a Crown, will not return till he hath conquered all the Enemies of this glorious Righteousness of his, and triumphed over them. I have chearfully thro' grace taken this Service in hand, under the Captain of my Salvation, thro whose strength and assistance I hope for success to his praise and glory.

I ſhall in the firſt place prove that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is the only righteouſneſs that a Sinner is juſtified by before God, and the Arguments are theſe briefly :

§. 2. *Arg.* 1. That is the righteouſneſs only that a ſinner can be juſtified by, which fulfils that law which he hath broken ; But Chriſts Righteouſneſs is ſuch : For the *minor* our adverſaries would have us believe that they mean ſo, however, they often talk of ſatisfaction to the Law, their ſincerity therein will be tried in due time. As to the *major* its indubitable to any man of ſence, that its not another law can excuſe him from the condemnation of the law which he hath broken ; nor a righteouſneſs of another law, eſpecially ſuch as is imperfect and faulty, that will ſerve the turn. God never abandoned nor relaxed his original Law, (though others as branches in poſitive laws for a time being, may be) but that was perfectly fulfilled in Chriſt.

§. 3. *Arg.* 2. That Righteouſneſs which merits the Juſtification of a Sinner before God, is that righteouſneſs only by which, and for which he is juſtified before God ; but the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is ſuch, *Ergo.* For the *minor* our adverſaries grant it, that Chriſt merited and purchaſed our Juſtification, *i. e.* by works of our own, and that our Righteouſneſs and Juſtification are effects thereof, and therefore there needs no further Proof here ; but we muſt come to the *major* which pincheth hard upon them ; but it appears to be true, 1. Becauſe there is no legal Diſcharge of an accuſed perſon, without a meritorious righteouſneſs appearing ; Now theſe men, with the *Socinians* ſay (ſome at leaſt, and others do but liſp at it, Mr. *B.* ſays it downright, he knowing it to be inſeparable from the *Popiſh* Doctrine) that their righteouſneſs is not meritorious, being imperfect, if it be not, its no juſtifying righteouſneſs ; I will ſtand by it, that there is no righteouſneſs can claim Juſtification but upon the merit of their action in the performance of the preceptive part, and if they be juſtified by the new law, they muſt be juſtified by the merits thereof ; but we aſſert that the righteouſneſs muſt anſwer the old law broken, and it muſt be, as in Juſtice it doth ſo ſatisfie that law, that it lays claim to Juſtification by vertue of thoſe merits, and no other righteouſneſs will paſs there, but what is ſuch.

§. 5. *Arg.* 4. The righteouſneſs typified by the Prieſts Sacrifices of old, was the righteouſneſs whereby a ſinner is juſtifi d in the ſight of God ; but the righteouſneſs of Chriſt alone is ſuch, *Ergo.* For the *major* our adverſaries, Mr. *Bellarmine* and Mr. *H.* ſay, that Chriſts Righteouſneſs is the thing for which *id propter quod*, not as the End but as an Inſtrument of the

the Efficient, and a meritorious cauſe, and our Faith and Obedience is the *per quam*, which they ſay doth not denote Merit, and in the *Proteſtant* ſence *per quam* denotes only inſtrumentality; but indeed here's theſe mens Commutation, they make Chriſt's Righteouſneſs the Inſtrument, and that remote enough too, and our own righteouſneſs the Formal Cauſe of Juſtification, which in truth is their meritorious cauſe; upon their own Poſitions the *major* muſt be granted. The *minor* will be very demonſtrable upon theſe reaſons, That the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is only ſuch, the *id propter quod*, and *per quod* a ſinner is juſtified in Gods ſight. 1. *i. e.* The righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified, is not two, but one, and Chriſts is that, as the Scripture affirms. 2. That for which a man is meritoriouſly juſtified *in tribuno legis*, is that by which he is juſtified; ſo the law knows no difference in thoſe terms, for it doth nothing by any righteouſneſs but it doth it for that righteouſneſs. 3. The Spirit of God therefore uſeth the *Greek* Prepoſitions, promiſcuouſly in this caſe, as hath in part been ſhewed. 4. No Sinner therefore can ſtand in Judgment, but by and for this Righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

§. 5. *Arg.* 4. The Righteouſneſs typified by the Prieſtly Sacrifices of old, was the righteouſneſs whereby a ſinner is juſtified in the ſight of God, but this was the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt only, *Ergo.* The *major* and *minor* are ſo clear that no Chriſtian that hath read the Scripture with any underſtanding, can deny either; if any ſhall ſay, its not eaſie to defend it, there's the whole Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, yea, the whole Scripture to prove them; all the Devils in Hell cannot caſt down this Fortreſs, and I leave it therefore to the intelligent Reader, let him ſearch the Scriptures, they teſtifie of it.

§. 6. *Arg.* 5. That Righteouſneſs which is a ranſoming and redeeming righteouſneſs from a legal Bondage is the juſtifying righteouſneſs of a ſinner before God, but Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is that alone which is a redeeming and ranſoming righteouſneſs, *Ergo.* The *minor* is true, none that call themſelves Chriſtians dare to fly ſo audaciouſly in the face of Chriſt, and deny plain Scripture, to deny this, if they do, there's enough to prove it, to the meaneſt Chriſtian; The *major* therefore, I will prove beyond all contradiction; That righteouſneſs which meritoriouſly diſchargeth the ſinner from his Bondage under the Law, the condemnation and curſe of it, is juſtifying Righteouſneſs; but Chriſts Righteouſneſs is ſuch, *Rom.* 8. 34. *Gal.* 3. 13. and divers places, for a diſcharge of a perſon from under the Bonds, Impriſonments, and Curſe of the Law, is his Juſtification, and the righteouſneſs for which he is diſcharged is his Juſtification:

§. 7. *Arg.* 6. That Righteouſneſs which only can juſtifie a Sinner againſt the Law, is the Righteouſneſs whereby a Sinner is Juſtifyed in the ſight of God, but Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is ſuch. *Ergo*, I ſuppoſe the *major* is undeniable, except men will cavil at the Sun at noon day, and will any have the face to ſay, as to the *minor*, 1. That God hath not purer Eyes of Juſtice than to behold Iniquity, 2. That he exerciſeth juſtice by halves and not in the ſtricteſt and exacteſt manner, 3. Will they ſay their righteouſneſs is ſo perfect, as to anſwer Gods Law? The *Neonomians* ſay no. How will they dare to ſay then they are juſtifyed by a Righteouſneſs which is not anſwerable in perfection to the Law, but they will be juſtifyed by another Righteouſneſs the worſt they can think of by a Law coined *adequate* to *Antinomian* and licentious Principles? 4. A Sinners unrighteouſneſs is ſuch, that the Law could never look upon him for to be righteouſs in the ſight of God in his own righteouſneſs, becauſe, he hath been once a tranſgreſſor. *James* ſaith, *If a man transgreſs but in one Point he is guilty of all.* The Saints in Heaven tho glorified with Perfection, yet having been ſinners and tranſgreſſors of the Law, they could not ſtand Juſtifyed out of Chriſt's righteouſneſs, It is one thing to have perfection of Sanctification as to the preſent ſtanding and performances, and another thing to have perfection of Juſtification, wherein the leaſt believer here on Earth are as perfectly Juſtifyed and as righteous before God as the glorifyed Saints in Heaven. See *Col.* 1. 22. *Eph.* 6. 27. *Rev.* 14. 4. 5.

§. 8. *Arg.* 7. That Righteouſneſs which repairs all our unrighteouſneſſes loſt in the firſt *Adam*, is the only righteouſneſs whereby we are Juſtityed before God: but Chriſt's righteouſneſs is ſuch and no other righteouſneſs. *Ergo*, as to the *major*, for all other righteouſneſs comes ſhort of what we loſt in the firſt *Adam*, our unrighteouſneſs was our breach of the preceptive part of Gods Law, this was our unrighteouſneſs, our loſs and puniſhment was alſo very great, in reſpect of moral original righteouſneſs, and coming under the wages of ſin which is death or liableneſs thereto by the Law in all acceptations. Now Chriſt as a ſecond *Adam* brought in a righteouſneſs upon both theſe accounts. 1. His perfect compleat active Obedience in oppoſition to *Adam*'s Sin, obedience to diſobedience. *Rom.* 5. 14. *If thro the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace* [which is Chriſt's obedience] *which is by one man, hath abounded unto many.* So in every *v.* to the end of the *chapter* Chriſt's obedience was not only to ſave us from puniſhment but to take of all the ſpots of ſin in the ſight of God. Will *Neonomian* righteouſneſs

neſs, take away Original ſin in the ſight of God, bring us into the perfection of the Law in the ſight of God, repair the preceptive part of God's Law? Nay, will it do any thing to take us of from puniſhment? No, they ſay not, if not its worth nothing.

§. 9. *Arg.* 8. That Righteouſneſs whereby a Sinner is at peace with God, reconciled to him, and hath acceſs unto his preſence with boldneſs, is the Righteouſneſs whereby he is Juſtified: but the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is ſuch, the *minor* is evident. *Rom.* 5. 1, 2. *Eph.* 2. 13, 14. *Rom.* 5. 10. *Col.* 1. 20. The *major* appears, Juſtification is our reconciling peace with God Ground of boldneſs of acceſs in Faith and Prayer. *Rom.* 5. 1. *Heb.* 4. 15, 16.

§. 10. *Arg.* 9. That Righteouſneſs which Chriſt pleads in Heaven for us, is our Juſtifying righteouſneſs, but it is his own righteouſneſs which he pleads in Heaven, for us. *Ergo*, This righteouſneſs is our Juſtification righteouſneſs. Doth Chriſt plead our righteouſneſs or his own? Not ours ſure, he pleads for acceptance of our ſervices thro' his righteouſneſs, he entred into the holyeſt of all with his blood. What was it to procure? A Juſtifying righteouſneſs of ours for him to plead before his Father?

§. 11. *Arg.* 10. If there be no name of any other, nor Salvation in any other among men beſides Chriſt's, than there's no righteouſneſs for Juſtification of a Sinner but Chriſt's; but the *antecedent* is true, *Acts.* 4. 12. the place ſo full and expreſs there's no diſputing it. But our *Neonomians* will deny the antecedent; for this is the ſtone that is ſet at naught by our new Goſpel builders; they will ſay that there's juſtification righteouſneſs in men, and in the name of themſelves and their own righteouſneſs they ſhall be Juſtified; but then I ſay, there's another name, and ſalvation in ſome other among men, if that juſtifying righteouſneſs is our ſalvation only. For what is in Chriſt, is it not in them? And tho Chriſt purchaſed it, the ſalvation is in them not in Chriſt.

§. 12. *Arg.* 11. If Chriſt be the end of the law for Righteouſneſs to every one that believeth, then his righteouſneſs is the only Juſtifying righteouſneſs, but Chriſt is ſo, the *antecedent* is true, *Rom.* 10. 4. all the aim and deſign of God in his law in making it, is that it may be anſwered in righteouſneſs, Chriſt is this end as to all ſaved ones, and as to believers; he ſaid not, that we are the end of the law by our own righteouſneſs, or that Chriſt merited that we ſhould be the end of the law, or ſhou'd be the righteouſneſs of a new law, but Chriſt is ſo; if their had been any other end for righteouſneſs, he would have told us of it. The conſequence needs no proof for whatever fully anſwer the

end of the law in active and passive obedience for us, is justifying righteousness in the eye of the law, it looks for no more; but the *Neonomians* will say, here is the old law meant, and Christ answered that, I say, then if he did justify us as to Old law righteousness, a fig for the New law and the pretended Justification thereby.

§. 13. *Arg.* 12. That righteousness which in a lively manner is held forth in the seals of the Covenant, and as seals of the righteousness of faith is justifying righteousness: but that is the righteousness of Christ, *Ergo.* For the *minor* thats plain, the washing with water held forth his washing us from our sins in his blood; the eating the bread and drinking the wine, it is to signify our feeding upon the Body of Christ by Faith, on which he bore our sins, and drinking of his Blood which he shed for the remission of Sins. As to the *major* its plain they hold forth Christ to be our justifying righteousness, *Act.* 2. 38. and that we live upon this righteousness (as the Lord's Supper holds forth in a spiritual eating the Body and drinking his Blood,) do we shew forth our own death or life of works or his? that they should be seals of our own righteousness and not of Christs.

§. 14. *Arg.* 13. If no righteousness but a Suretiship, and Preistly righteousness can justify a Sinner before God, then Christ's righteousness alone can do it, but nothing but a Suretiship and Priestly righteousness can, *&c.* The *minor* is proved because we are Bankrouts have nothing to pay, neither in our selves by nature, nor bestowed on us, that which the holiest man hath in sanctification bearing no proportion to our sins and God's demands, therefore it must be the righteousness of a Surety, that's holy, harmless, *&c.* that pays a righteousness for us *adæquate* to the demands of the Law. The consequence will hold because there was no other Surety to God for Sinners, but Christ; he hath engaged to pay for us, and hath paid and his payment accepted. *His Blood was shed for many for the remission of sins, he was the great high Priest, and as such he was a Surety.* Heb. 7. 21. 22. ch. 2. 17.

§. 15. *Arg.* 14. If there be no Gospel righteousness in respect of a Sinner but Christ's righteousness, then Christ's righteousness is our Justifying righteousness; but there's no Gospel righteousness. The *minor* is thus proved, The righteousness by which a Sinner is Justified is Gospel. 1. Because its not wrought by himself but by another for him. 2. Because its given to him freely; its a Law righteousness in respect of Christ: Now when by our graces and duties we claim Justification as due to us upon performing conditions, we make all our works legal and put them in

the room of Chriſt's righteouſneſs for Juſtification. The conſequence is clear becauſe a Sinner can be ſaved only by a Goſpel righteouſneſs, that of Chriſt that is offer'd him, and he receives as the Goſpel glad tidings, for its good news and Goſpel to any man, to hear of one that is able and willing to pay his debt for him.

§. 16. *Arg.* 15. If there be no life to be given to a Sinner by the righteouſneſs of any law perform'd by him, then the righteouſneſs of Chriſt is the only righteouſneſs that he is juſtified by; but there is no life to be given to any Sinner, by the righteouſneſs of any law perform'd by him, *Ergo.* The *antecedent* is fully proved by the *Gal.* 3. 21. where Law is uſed indefinitely, in both parts of the Texts as well the laſt as the firſt, and it ſhould have been rendred thus, *if there had been a Law given which could have given Life, then Righteouſneſs had been by a Law*; therefore this place is fully excluſive of juſtifying righteouſneſs by a new Law, and God never made ſuch a Law. The conſequence is clear if all other Law righteouſneſs but Chriſt's be excluded, then Chriſt's righteouſneſs is that alone by which a Sinner is Juſtified. Theſe *Arguments* are ſtrong and enough to prove what we aſſert, and againſt all the World if the Scripture and Reaſon enlightned thereby may take place. The Scripture is ſo full of proof, that theſe Sixteen might be made Sixty, but brevity is call'd for, by the circumſtances that attend Printing.

CHAP. XVII.

Of the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs.

Section 1. *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is Imputed to us, and* Paul *ſaith ſo.* §. 2. *Argument* 1. §. 3. *Arg.* 2. *and* 3. §. 4. *Arg.* 4. §. 5. *Arg.* 5. §. 6. *Arg.* 6. §. 7. *Arg.* 7. §. 8. *Arg.* 8. §. 9. *Arg.* 9. §. 10. *Arg.* 10. 11.

Section 1. Our Adverſaries ſay they own the *Imputation of Righteouſneſs to Juſtification*; but they ſay, its there own, not Chriſt's: Now we ſhall prove that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is Imputed. They ſay, its no where ſaid that Chriſt's Righ-

teousneſs is Imputed: We ſay, it is in all that is ſaid by the Apoſtle *Paul*, ſo plain, that all but he that will ſhut his Eyes perverſly muſt ſee it. I ſhall but give brief hints of it, 1. The Apoſtle *Paul*, *Rom.* 4. ſpeaking ſo often of Imputation, gives us plainly to underſtand, that he means no Imputation but of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to Juſtification; for his Diſcourſe in the 4th *chap.* is continued from *ver.* 25. of the 3d to prove the Doctrine of Juſtification by the Propitiation, Blood and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; and ſhews how Faith honours this Righteouſneſs, and wrongs not the law by it, but eſtabliſheth it. In the 4th *ch.* he goes on to exclude all Juſtification by any works, and ſhews in *Abraham* and *David*, they took Chriſt's Righteouſneſs. *viz.* that ſpoken *ch.* 3. 25. by Faith, for their Imputed righteouſneſs, unto juſtification and remiſſion, and covering of them from the Eye of God's juſtice; wherefore Chriſt is call'd our Propitiation, in alluſion to the Golden cover of the Ark, that hid the Law and was the mercy ſeat; now briefly to ſhew that by Imputation ſo often mention'd in this *chap.* he meant the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to our Juſtification, he tells us *ver.* 22. that what God had promiſed to *Abraham*, *viz.* the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which he was fully by Faith perſwaded of, was Imputed to him for Righteouſneſs; now ſaith the Apoſtle, it was not written for the ſake of *Abraham* only, but for us alſo to whom it ſhall be Imputed, *i. e.* the Righteouſneſs in the Promiſe; if we believe on him, that raiſed up the Lord *Jeſus Chriſt* from the dead, who was delivered for our offences and raiſed again for our Juſtification *i. e.* if we believe in God, thro' the full perfect and compleat righteouſneſs of Chriſt, for our Righteouſneſs could not have been full and compleat without his Reſurrection, and his Juſtification as a publick head of all the Elect; who raiſed was Juſtified, as having wrought out a full and compleat Juſtifying righteouſneſs for them, they are incouraged and invited to take it for their Righteouſneſs by Faith, and they might aſſure themſelves of the Imputation thereof; and proceeds in the next *chap.* to ſay, that having taken this Imputed righteouſneſs by Faith, they are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith, and to have peace with God, and acceſs unto the grace of God thro the ſaid righteouſneſs.

§. 2. *Arg.* 1. Now then I Argue, if Chriſt in the promiſe be Imputed for Righteouſneſs to *Abraham* and every believer, and the Apoſtle ſaith ſo, then the Imputation here ſpoken of, is the Imputation of Chriſt's righteouſneſs; but the *antecedent* is true, from *Gal.* 3. 21, 22. its plain, that it was what God had promiſed to him was Imputed to him. The conſequence needs no proof, for it was Chriſt was promiſed, and he ſaw Chriſt's day in that promiſe,

and

and the Promise of Christ was the Gospel preached to him.

Again, to prove the Apostle means the Righteousness of Christ is imputed, *If the delivery of Christ for our sins, and raising him again for Justification, was the Righteousness of Christ for Justification; then this is that which was imputed not to* Abraham *for righteousness only, but also to every Believer by the Text*; and therefore the *minor* is fully there proved; and I think as to the *major*, that none can deny the Life, Death and Resurrection of Christ to be his compleat Righteousness.

§. 3. *Arg.* 2. *He that was made of God righteousness to us is made by imputation of his righteousness to us; but Christ is made so of God*, 1 Cor. 1. 30. but saith Mr. *Cl.* he is made righteousness as he is made *Wisdom*. So *Righteousness*, *Sanctification* and *Redemption*, but it follows not only that he be made of great advantage to a Christian, but these several ways, that he is not one thing as the other; he is not a Prophet as a Priest; and if he should mean *made righteousness* in Mr. *Cl*'s. sence, then he should be but made *sanctification* twice taken, for Mr. *Cl*'s justifying righteousness is but Sanctification; its, he is made the Spring, Head and Root of Sanctification, and legally made *righteousness to us*.

Arg. 3. Again, *If we be made the righteousness of God in Christ*, [where its plain this righteousness of God is in Christ] *then the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, but we are made the righteousness of God in him, Ergo.* the *antecedent* is proved by, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. as to the *major*, the *Neonomians* say, the righteousness of God is our own righteousness: We say, nay, the righteousness of God is said to be in Christ, and we are made so by imputation, for Christ could not be made Sin for us, but by Imputation, and if it is meant of a Sacrifice for Sin, even such were made Sin by Imputation, and therefore we are made the righteousness of God in Christ by Imputation.

§. 4. *Arg.* 4. Again, *If Christ hath merited our Justification, Christs Merits are imputed in themselves to Justification; but Christ hath merited our Justification*: The *minor* is granted by these Gentlemen: They tell us, that Christs Merits are *id propter quod*, we are justified for the sake, or rather by reason of Christs Merits; but they mean not that Christ purchased the Sinner's perform'd condition of the New law, but that he procured of God a new law for man to perform the condition of: Now this is no more to be the cause of Justification, than God in making a Law was a cause of Sin; for sin is not Imputed where there's no law; and where there is a Law, there will be Justification or Condemnation; Christ merited a Law and made one, therefore for the sake of Christ, we are Justified by this Law; here's Christs law

causa sine qua non with a Witness. As to the consequence, if Justification be an effect of Merits, and it be a Juridical effect, then Merits which is the cause, must be imputed to the person on whom these effects must fall: What moves the Court or Judge to justify this or that person, his own Merits or the Merits of another? Not his own, but the Merits of another: Then these Merits are imputed, for it quickly and plainly appears what is imputed to any, whether merits of Condemnation or merits of Justification, for Justice goes by nothing but Merit; and therefore mens own righteousness cannot justify because it cannot Merit: And do not our *Neonomians* speak as the *Socinians* in this point, and mumble as if their mouths were full of plumbs? Now therefore, if Christs Merit be brought into Court, as a meritorious cause of the Sinners Justification, they are imputed to him for his Justification as if he had merited himself.

§. *Arg.* 5. They say, *Christs Merits cannot be Imputed, but the Effects are Imputed.* And I Argue, If Christs Righteousness be Imputed, its Imputed as a cause of Justification, or in the Effect; [it should be as an Effect or the Disjunction is ridiculous] but its not Imputed in the Effect, *Ergo.* In and as the Cause, for the Effect is not the Cause but contrary, its another thing; so that to say Christs Merits are imputed, and so imputed to the person Justified is nonsense. But what are the effects imputed? All the Benefits purchased by Christ. For is Justification an effect imputed? Sure not. Is Justification imputed to Justification? Sure that's most absurd. Is Mortification imputed to Justification? That looks very odd. Is Vocation and Adoption, or Glorification, all or any of them Imputed to Justification? for they are Effects of Christs Merits. But suppose they say, some of these or all, are to us imputed for righteousness unto Justification; I then Query, Whether the Righteousness perform'd by us in the new law Justification, be merited by Christ as an Effect? Do not I see them sneak away now and give no Answer, but upon another Subject, they will tell you that Faith and the condition of the New law, was not purchased by Christ, but are by the gift of Election only. And now I pray what's become of Justification, by Effects of Christs Merits? They will say, we are Justified by Imputing the Spirits operations to us for righteousness. Now this cannot be,

1. The Spirit never was incarnate, nor his Office to work a Righteousness for Justification; this was peculiar to Christ.

2. The fruits of the Spirit, when they come to be exerted, are called our works. and justly so, because Graces exercised, or Duties performed by us are so, these are all renounced as such by the Apostle *Paul.* Phil. 3. 8. and elsewhere. 3. What

3. What the Spirit doth in Justification, its office is by way of Application, it takes of Christs, and gives it to us; it applies and brings home to a sinner the Impetration of Christ, as Righteousness unto his Justification; hence the Spirit is said to justifie, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. in bringing to the Soul the Grace of Justification, and enstating him therein by faith, as he sanctifies by bringing in the Grace of Sanctification. Now then, if Christ's Righteousness cannot be imputed in the effect, and is imputed at all, then as the cause meritorious of Justification.

But they say, God cannot impute Christs Righteousness to us, because we did not perform it, and God is a God of Truth, he cannot impute that to us which we did not. To which I answer,

1. That God doth not reckon we performed Christs Righteousness.

2. God may give us his Son for righteousness,, *Rom.* 8. and give us this righteousness, *Rom.* 5. 5.

3. He may accept it for us on law terms, as our righteousness to Justification, and all this is according to Truth and Righteousness imputing it to us in a Law Sense.

4. The Argument will fall upon *Neonomian* Justification, for that's to call that righteousness which is unrighteousness, and not according to Truth, as hath been shewed: Mr. *Cl.* makes it a great Argument that the active righteousness of Christ must not be imputed, because Christ did not obey that we should not obey, and where's the *Antinomian* that says so? but we say, that Christ did and suffered all that the law required of him as a Second *Adam*, and our Surety, and his obeying in doing is no hindrance, but a Gospel ground and reason of our doing and obeying: As Christ did not suffer that we should not suffer, but not suffer the Penally, so Christs doing was not that we should not obey Evangelically, but that we should but not obey legally, with expectation of our Justification by our works, or from a law, for that is to be under a Law, and not under Grace, and to sin instead of obeying, *Rom.* 6, *&c.*

Lastly, If Christ's righteousness be taken as a meritorious cause in a sinner's Justification, it is imputed as such to the person justified; the effect of this cause is the sinner's Justification, which is his proper Discharge, and this is not Imputation, but Judgment upon it, and Delivery in Law, and suppose the effects of Merit could be imputed, the cause and reason thereof must be first imputed; for the Law doth nothing in way of Condemnation or Justification but upon a meritorious cause imputed unto Condemnation or Justification; and how absurd is it to say Condemnation is imputed, but its proper to say, the sin that merits it is imputed.

§. 6.

§. 6. *Arg.* 6. That Righteousness which is accepted in law unto Justification is imputed to the person justified, but Christ's Merits are accepted of God to the Sinner's Justification. The *major* must be owned for Truth by the *Neonomians*, otherwise they could not assert their Justification by Works. The *minor* hath been counted sound Divinity by most *Protestants*, and many *Papists*; but whether it be or be not, the Scripture affirms it roundly; see for a taste, *Eph.* 5. 2. *chap.* 1. 6. for an acceptation in law, must be an imputation of Merit to Justification, and can be upon no other account, either of a man's own, or of another's for him, the law looks at the value of his Money or Works that he brings into Court, not how he came by either, whether by Gift or otherwise.

§. 7. *Arg.* 7. *That righteousness through which Sin is not imputed to condemnation is the righteousness through which a man is imputed righteous unto Justification: But Christs righteousness is that through which sin is not imputed to condemnation, Ergo.* The *minor* is very clear from *Rom.* 8. 1. 34. *who is he that condemneth, it is Christ that died,* chap. 4. 6, 7, 8: *Blessed is the man whose sins are forgiven, to whom God doth not impute sin*; and this is told us is a righteousness without works, that which comes on *Jews* and *Gentiles*, that which covers Sin from the Eye of God's Justice, therefore that which lies in the Death and Resurrection of Christ, *v.* 24, 25. likewise 2 *Cor.* 5. 15. *God was in Christ reconciling the world, i. e.* justifying, for God reconciles none but by Justification; reconciliation is essential to it, and therefore *non* imputation of sin; for while a man lies under a law charge of sin he is unrighteous, till he be imputed righteous by the law. The *major* is evident from what is said in proof of the *minor*, for *non* imputation of sin to a sinner is essential to his Justification, which can be no otherwise then by a covering righteousness; and when a law imputes sin, the same law must justify by imputing to him an *adequate* and satisfactory righteousness.

§. 8. *Arg.* 8. *The Sins of Sinners under the old Testament were Imputed Typically to the High-Priest and Sacrifices, which is very easie to make appear, Ergo.* The Sins of all sav'd sinners are Imputed really to Christ, and his righteousness to them. See 1 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Rom.* 3. 25. *Heb.* 9. 15.

§. 9. *Arg.* 9. *That which cannot be pleaded for Pardon or Justification unless it be Imputed, is when its pleadibly imputed unto Justification: But Christs very righteousness is pleadible, &c. Ergo.* The *minor* I suppose these Gentlemen dare not deny, for I find tho they will not have it their immediate righteousness by imputation, yet they will have it for some remote and as a reserve at a

dead

dead liſt, when conſcience ſees that neither the New Law, nor the righteouſneſs thereof will ſerve the turn. Now that Chriſts righteouſneſs is not pleadible without Imputation to us, neither by Chriſt in heaven nor by us on earth its plain, for if Chriſt be never ſo righteous, his plea is anſwerered in ſaying thou art righteous for thy ſelf; I never imputed thy righteouſneſs to theſe, let them plead for their own Juſtification. If they plead it with God, the anſwer is, Chriſt is righteous for himſelf; his righteouſneſs not imputed to thee, no more then the righteouſneſs of one of the Angels; and therefore Chriſts righteouſneſs being pleadible its imputed; without Imputation its not pleadible for us or by us.

§. 10. *Arg.* 10. *That righteouſneſs which is a Suretiſhip righteouſneſs muſt be imputed, elſe its of no value to the offender; but Chriſts righteouſneſs is a Suretiſhip righteouſneſs, he being a Surety his righteouſneſs muſt be ſuch.* And as for the *major* its plain that the juſtice that accepts one perſon to be Surety for another, doth impute or account the righteouſneſs of the Surety to that other, or elſe it accepts not. the Surety is rejected now that Chriſt was accepted as a Surety is beyond all queſtion, *Heb.* 7. 22.

§. 11. *Arg.* 11. *The righteouſneſs of the ſecond* Adam *is an Imputed righteouſneſs, for* 1. *as* Adam *was a Publick perſon that had a Covenant ſtanding for all his Seed, ſo the* 2*d Chriſt was, and had for his.* 2. *As* Adam*'s Sin came by Imputation upon his Seed ſo Chriſts righteouſneſs on his as fully appears from* Rom. 5. But this I muſt not now enlarge upon, the Apoſtle is ſo full and plain therein, that I never could ſee any thing ſaid to oppoſe, that could have weight with any learned and rational Interpreter, if unprejudiced againſt Truth.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

What Interest and concern Faith hath in our Justification.

Section 1. *Of the Nature of Faith as spoken of.* §. 2. *What this Faith is?* §. 3. *And how we are said to be Justified by Faith.* §. 4. *Arg. To prove that Faith is not our Righteousness.*

Section 1. HAving proved Christ's Righteousness to be the only Righteousness for a Sinner's Justification in Gods sight, and that this Righteousness is certainly Imputed to every one that believes; we shall in the last place enquire, what concern and intrest Faith hath in our Justification? I shall not speak of Faith accompanying Salvation at large (as the Apostle doth *Heb.* 11: Wherein he also comprehends Justifying, (among the other Senses there spoken of) but only of Faith as it referrs to Justification and the righteousness thereof.

§. 2. Justifying Faith is a gift of God, whereby a poor sinner believes in God unto eternal life thro Jesus Christ. 1. It is a gift of God, in respect of the grace of God and the work of the Spirit, *Eph.* 2. 8. 2. It is a purchased benefit for an Elect person. 2 *Pet.* 1. 3. It's a Gift to a Sinner; there's no grace lives tell Faith, then Christ lives in him; its to a poor undone broken Sinner. 4. This is a gift of grace to believe in God and Christ; 1. To be perswaded of the truth of the Law, his certain curse under it, impossibility of coming to the works thereof; That its a saying worthy of all acceptance, that Christ came into the world to save Sinners, whereof *Paul* saith, *he was one of the chiefest*; not that he was righteous subordinately to Christ's to qualify him for it: This is that which is properly call'd *fides*, but its hard to distinguish this from the Faith of a natural man and hipocrite; therefore, 2. There is believing in *i. e.* resting upon God and Christ, resting on the faithfulness of God in his promise of a good thing to us, as for eternal life, and for righteousness in Christ; now faithfulness belongs to persons; truth unto things, when the Soul doth not only believe the thing promised true, but believes him faith-

faithful who hath promiſed, and from thence doth ſtay himſelf and his Soul acquiſce in it. This is properly *fiducia*, truſting in God. 3. There's a particular application of Chriſt in the promiſe and the Soul unto God in Chriſt, believing that all the promiſes, eſpecially thoſe that concern eternal life and juſtification by Chriſt's righteouſneſs, are yea and Amen in him, made and perform'd in him.

§. 3. Hence, by Faith we are ſaid to be juſtified. 1. Becauſe the righteouſneſs of Chriſt is the object of our Faith; it is that we believe to, and come unto believing, *Rom.* 10.10. *We believe unto righteouſneſs.* 2. By Faith a man is devorced from the Law and legal righteouſneſs, and comes into a new marriage relation to Chriſt for righteouſneſs and life. Rom. 7. 3. Becauſe its that grace only whereby a man can go out of himſelf, and fetch in the righteouſneſs of another. 4. It is that grace which from the very law of its nature which it hath thro grace, doth always deny it ſelf any thing of righteouſneſs for Juſtification and gives all the glory of righteouſneſs unto Chriſt alone. 5. In that it doth *fiducially* reſt and depend thereon believing. 6. It dwells upon an object of righteouſneſs which is not ſeen, by ſence or reaſon, yea it is the hypoſtaſis of Chriſt's righteouſneſs in the Soul; Chriſt lives as it were in our Faith, take away Chriſt from it, and you leave it a dead nothing or worſe, it returns to unbelief. 7. Becauſe by this Faith the Soul ſees God at peace with him, and he hath peace in himſelf, and the controverſy is at an end between God and him, thro this Imputed and believed righteouſneſs. 8. The juſtified one as he draws his firſt breath of the new man in believing unto righteouſneſs, ſo he lives upon this righteouſneſs in all his Chriſtian courſe, in that Chriſts righteouſneſs may be called the righteouſneſs of Faith, for Meat and Drink. *John* 6.51,53. 9. Faith hath hereby all juſtifiable ways to God, Chriſt is thereby his way unto the Father, he can have acceſs to the grace wherein he ſtands, comes thro this righteouſneſs with boldneſs to the Throne of grace, and receives remiſſion of ſins, and every good, and perfect gift, God having not ſpared his Son, but given him for us, hence he will not withhold any good thing. 10. As it receives all grace in and with juſtifying grace, ſo it gives and aſcribes all to free grace in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, both the gift of righteouſneſs and faith it ſelf, and the life eternal given to ſuch a poor wretch in and thro Jeſus Chriſt. 11. In that this grace being filled with Chriſts righteouſneſs, is leading to all fruits of Chriſts righteouſneſs imputed and believed, all which appear

pear in the exercise of all holy affections, graces and duties to the mortification of sin and growth in obedience and conformity to Christ.

§. 14. Now having shewed the Excellency of this Grace in its Nature and Kind, we must shew you that it is not Christ, nor must not take his Throne or Crown from him, yea abhors nothing more if true, but will keep a Believer always a poor, humble, broken, and contrite hearted Sinner. Therefore we assert, and Christ with his whole Word will stand by us in it, that our Faith as a Grace of the Spirit or Work of ours is not imputed for Righteousness to Justification; I shall but Name a few Arguments convincing enough, and shew thereby the way to others to do the same.

1. Faith is for the Honour of Christ our High-Priest upon the Throne, if it takes to it self justifying Righteousness, it takes the Crown from his Head, and sets it upon his own for the great end of Christ's Humiliation and Exaltation, was the working out of this Righteousness.

2. If Faith be our Righteousness, then Faith is its own Object, when you bid Men believe unto Justification, you must bid them believe in themselves; and bid them by Faith go to their Faith for Righteousness and Life, what's Absurder?

3. If God impute Faith it self as a Work to Justification, then Faith must be imputed as meritorious of Justification. For, 1. Christs Righteousness is so imputed. 2. No Righteousness can be imputed otherwise to Justification, but such as is meritorious of it, Justification being a Law-act.

4. Faith making it self Righteousness for Justification by a Law, makes it self altogether Legal as much as any Works whatever, insomuch, that it is not an evangelical Work, so that it ought not to justifie as a Work by their own Rule, that we are not justified by the legal works, but we have proved all their Works legal.

5. That that can't cover Sin, and take off the Imputation of it can't be justifying Righteousness and take off the the Imputation of Sin, for faith did not die for Sin, or was made a Sacrifice for it to bear the Sin of many.

6 The Priests and Sacrifices of Old were Types of Christs Righteousness for Justification of a Sinner, not of the Sinners righteousness; and the faithful looked upon themselves as sinners Typically justified in the Righteousness Typified, and not in their Faith as a Work done.

7. If

7. If our Faith in it self be our Righteousness, then our unbelief is, for that Faith must believe that Christs Righteousness is not imputed to us for Justification, this his high unbelief according to the Scripture.

8. If Faith say it justifie as a Work, then Faith excludes it self, the very Nature of it; the *Neonomian* say, the Law of Faith is the New-law, if so, then it excludes it self. for the Law of Faith excludes boasting, and Works of a Law; *i. e.* the very Nature of Faith, if it be good, is so.

9. If Faith justifie as a Work, then Faith justifies not without Works, for if it be a Work it self, and justifying as such, then it justifieth not without Works, because it is a Work, contrary to *Rom.* 4. 6.

10. If Faith be Imputed for Righteousness, then the Blood of Christ is not, but we are to be justified by the Blood of Christ, and the Scripture saith, we are, by Faith in his Blood.

11. If Faith Justifies as a Work, then no more is ascribed to Faith than to other Graces in the concern of our Justification; but the Apostle ascribes more concern to Faith than other Graces; and then why doth he oppose Faith to Works? Is it not, that its more the Office of Faith as to Justification, the *Neonomian* say, it is the same with other Graces, &c. So Mr. *Cl. Justifying Faith is the same thing in Substance with Effectual Calling, Repentance, Regeneration, forming Christ in the Soul, the new Creature*, &c. Is not a great deal of the Scripture in vain, hath not *Paul* wrote two Epistles in vain, where he makes it his Main Business to beat down Justification by Works, and oppose them to one another, and now he tells us, that Faith and Gospel Works [*i. e.* legal] are all one.

12. That which justifies as a Righteousness, justifies eternally, *Dan.* 9. but Faith can't justifie eternally, because Faith ceaseth in Heaven, but justifying Righteousness doth not, yea all the Righteousness of the New-law must cease, 1 *Cor.* 13. 10.

14. That which is not the fœderal Condition of the Covenant of Grace, can't be our Righteousness in it self; but Faith is not the fœderal Condition, because Faith is promised in the Covenant, given by Grace purchased by Christ, part of Eternal Life, a means to lay hold of the Condition; but I shall not enlarge upon this now, only make one Quotation at last. Mr. *R. Capel*, who wrote of Temptation, saith, speaking of the Conditions of the Covenant. *In this Matter I am of the Opinion of* Kendal, *that the Covenant (be means of Grace) was not made with us, but with Christ* [*this was the Assembly's Judgment*] *for us*; *and for the main, I am clear of Opinion, that the Covenant of Grace cannot stand with*

with any Condition of ours at all, for that I wish the Learned to consult Junius. *To deliver my Opinion,* Adam *casting himself out of his Estate, the Covenant of Works fell void: Then it pleased God to fill up this Room with a New Covenant, commonly called his last Testament, wherein he bequeathed Grace and Glory on no other Condition that I know of out of the Scriptures, but the Death of the Testator,* i. e. *Jesus Christ, that as the First Covenant was built on the Righteousness of the first* Adam, *so the Second was built on the Righteousness of the second. It is beyond my Brain to conceive, that God should immediately make a Covenant with us, who were Children of Disobedience and of Wrath, who could not be capable of any such Covenant or Conditions, but it was with Christ for us,* Adam *lost his Righteousness, the Foundation of the first Covenant, but the Righteousness of Christ the Second can never be lost, and therefore the second Covenant or rather Testament, can never be broken or disanulled,* Condition of the Covenant, *p.* 260.

FINIS
MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

PAge 38. *line* 2. *read* partaker. *p.*39. *l.*32. *r.* relaxed. *p.*42. *l.*23. *r.* Justice. *p.*43. *l.*36. *r.* we could not. *p.*46. *l.*17. *r.* per quam. *p.*48. *l.*16. *r.* Is it by Imputation? *p.*49. *l.*22. *r.* God justifies. *p.*50. *l.*34. *r.* their sins. *p.*57. *l.*34. *r.* the only. *p.*64. *l.*23. *dele*; *r.* bottom they must be *Pelagians*. *p.*66. *l.*2. *r.* is it not so? *p.*72. *l.*27. *dele* ω. *p. ibid. l.*28. *r.* ἔργοις. *p.*73. *l.*40. *r.* Christs righteousness and us. *p.*78. *l.*27. *r.* would not be. *p.*79. *l. prope antep. dele* no. *p.* 85. *l.*16. *r.* Gal.3.21. *p.*86. *l.*21. *r.* Gal.3.21. *p.*87. *l.*3. *ab ult. r.* for Saviour. self. *p.*88. *l* 23. *r.* Gal.3.21. *l.*37. *r.* is manifest. *p.*99. *l.*16. *dele* not. *p.*100. *l.*3. *dele* and *l.*6. *r.* yea. 123. *l.*13. *r.* addicted to it, *l.*35. *r.* should not be. *p.*126. *l.*10. *r.* righteousness twice. *p.*133. *l.*13. נצל *l.*31. false *Hebrew*. *p.*134. *l.*20. *r.* καλαλομὴν. *p.*148. *l* 17. *r.* ך, *l.*29. *r.* ע for ץ. *l.*34. *dele* the *before events*. *p.* 149. *l.* 5. *r.* סֹפֵר. *p.*155. *l.*6. *a fine*, *r.* unprofitable. *p.*158. *l.*6. *ab ult. r.* ושת. 159 false *Hebrew*. *p.* 160. *l.* 6. *ab ult. r. Arg.*3, The righteousness for which, and by which a sinner is justified.